

VOLUME XI

NUMBER 2

PERIODICAL ROOM
RECEIVED
17 1916
UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY
April 1916

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to research
in the Languages, Literatures, History,
and Life of Classical Antiquity • •

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

Agents: The Cambridge University Press, London and Edinburgh; Karl W. Hiersemann,
Leipzig; The Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha, Tokyo, Osaka, and Kyoto

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*
WILLIAM GARDNER HALE
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER
HENRY W. PRESCOTT
FRANK BIGELOW TARBELL

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK FROST ABBOTT, *Princeton University*
CHARLES E. BENNETT, *Cornell University*
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
FRANCIS W. KELSEY, *University of Michigan*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*
HANNS OERTEL, *Yale University*

WILLIAM PETERSON, *McGill University*
SAMUEL BALL FLATNER, *Western Reserve University*
JOHN C. BOLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*
BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, *University of California*
JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, *Cambridge, Mass.*

VOL. XI

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1916

No. 2

The Interpretation of Roman Comedy	By Henry W. Prescott	125
Assumed Contradictions in the Seasons of the <i>Odyssey</i>	By John A. Scott	148
Horace an Atticist	By M. B. Ogle	156
Source-Material for Jonson's <i>Epigrams</i> and <i>Forest</i>	By William Dinsmore Briggs	169
The Institution of Athenian Arbitrators	By Robert J. Bonner	191
The Date of the <i>Laterculus Veronensis</i>	By Clinton Walker Keyes	196
Dissimilative Writing in Republican Latin and <i>UO</i> in Plautus	By E. H. Sturtevant	202
Some Latin Etymologies	By Francis A. Wood	208
Notes and Discussions		211
<p>CARL D. BUCK: The Inscriptions of Halse, <i>AJA</i>, 1915, 438 ff.—PAUL SHOREY: Emendation of Plato <i>Logos</i> 795 B.—TENNEY FRANK: The Date of Cicero <i>Ad Att.</i> xv. 6.</p>		
Book Reviews		218

WHITE: *The Scholia on the "Aves" of Aristophanes* (Peppeler).—ZIEGLER: *Menschen- und Weltenwerden. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Mikrokosmosidee* (Robbins).—COOPER: *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (Flickinger).—PASCAL: *Dioniso e Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane* (Oldfather).—VOLLMEYER: *Poetae Latini Minores: Zum Homeris Latinus* (Oldfather).—SAN NICOLÒ: *Aegyptisches Vereinnahmen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer* (Calhoun).—DIETTERICH: *Nekyia. Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuer entdeckten Papyrusapokalypse* (Fiaker).—ORTZ: *Kennt Aristoteles die sogenannte tragische Katharsis?* (Milner).—WOODWARD AND MATTINGLY: *St. John Damascene, Barlaam and Ioasaph* (Robbins).—BUTLER: *Propertius with an English Translation* (Wheeler).—MILLER: *Xenophon Cyropaedia* (Misenar).—PETERSON: *Tacitus: Dialogues*; *HUTTON: Agricola and Germania* (Stuart).—SCHENKL: *Marci Antonini Imperatoris in senectutem libri* (Heidel).—URI: *Cicero und die epikureische Philosophie. Eine quellenkritische Studie* (Merrill).—HIRSCHFELD: *Kleine Schriften* (Frank).—DIEHL: *Euripides Medea mit Scholien*; *VON ARNIM: Supplementum Euripideum*; *DIEHL: Supplementum Sophocleum* (R. C. F.).—ERENOUT: *Morphologie historique du latin* (Kent).

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University Press. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$3.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$3.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following agents have been appointed and are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C., England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 18s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 4s. 4d. each.

For the Continent of Europe: KARL W. HIERSEMANN, Königstrasse, 20, Leipzig, Germany. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, M. 16.15 each; single copies, including postage, M. 5.30 each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sancho-me, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 6.50; single copies, including postage, Yen 2.15.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when they have been lost in transit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, June 20, 1906, at the Post-office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of July 16, 1894.

Y

LL

ity

in

ia

2

5

8

6

9

1

6

2

3

Classical Philology

VOLUME XI

April 1916

NUMBER 2

THE INTERPRETATION OF ROMAN COMEDY

BY HENRY W. PRESCOTT

By way of introduction to various studies of technique in Roman comedy I find it convenient to state briefly, with some illustrative examples, the dominant tendencies, as I see them, in the higher criticism of Plautus and Terence, to suggest the weakness of modern method, and to indicate the possibility of a different point of view and of safer courses of procedure. In such an introduction suggestion rather than demonstration, exposition rather than extended argument, are the limited aims of the paper; and I hope that the brevity desirable in prolegomena will not be mistaken for dogmatic assertion.

Modern criticism establishes a norm as characteristic of Hellenistic comedy, and explains deviations from that norm in the Roman adaptations by certain known facts relating to the tradition of our Latin texts and the methods of composition followed by the Roman playwrights. The weakness of modern method may best be indicated by a consideration of the abnormal features—abnormal from the standpoint of modern critics—in several plays of Plautus; for this purpose I have chosen the *Rudens*, the *Persa*, and the *Stichus*. It is not my purpose to prove that the *Rudens* and the *Stichus* are not contaminated, or that the *Persa* is not from a Greek original of the Middle rather than of the New Greek comedy; I wish simply to illustrate from these plays how certain features of dramatic technique are handled by modern critics without due regard to the demands of

the audience in the theater, to the limitations set by the scenic background and the traditions of the literary type, to the restrictions which hamper the poet once he has sketched the main outline of his plot. In describing, therefore, the supposed abnormal features I shall briefly suggest the internal or external necessity which, in my opinion, made them inevitable in the Greek original; in this case they may not be explained as Roman defects due to contamination or retractation; and they conflict with a theory of artistic regularity in Hellenistic comedy which modern critics believe to have been induced through the influence of Euripides.

The *Rudens* of Plautus is not conspicuously unlike other Roman comedies. It is, however, a diffuse play. Some of this diffuseness, as the *licet*- and *censeo*-scenes near the end of the play perhaps attest, may be Plautus' contribution. But it is equally clear that no small amount of it is inherent in the Greek plot. A girl and her maid, carried off by a slave-dealer and his accomplice, are shipwrecked; the discovery of this girl's status as a free citizen must be established by tokens which she has lost in the storm at sea; these tokens must be found at a relatively late stage in the action by a neutral or friendly person, or group of persons; of those shipwrecked with her none is friendly save the maidservant, and as this servant is needed for various dramatic and economic effects in the earlier scenes of the play, before the recognition can take place, the dramatist may not use her to bring about the recovery of the tokens. It follows inevitably that an outside person, apart from the victims of the shipwreck, must accomplish the recovery; for this purpose a fisherman, Gripus, is invented, whose activity in the Roman play is limited to the latter half of the comedy. In the earlier action another slave, Sceparnio, served to connect minor chapters, to furnish some amusing effects; he now disappears; his function is completed; he was not available for the discovery of the tokens; Gripus, essential to the recognition theme, becomes prominent in the last two acts of the comedy.

Under these compelling circumstances a modern dramatist might make Gripus, if not thoroughly organic, at least less mechanically related to the action than the fisherman is in the Roman play. A playwright today, for example, might put in the mouth of Daemones,

the master of Gripus, in some of the opening scenes of the play, a casual remark to the effect that Gripus has gone out fishing, and that he wonders how the slave has fared during the storm; thus the audience would be duly prepared for the advent of the fisherman in later scenes. But in the extant play this casual remark, instead of being introduced early in the action is very mechanically brought in at vss. 897 ff. and immediately before Gripus' entrance; Daemones is very obviously lugged on the stage and haled off it (vss. 892-905) merely to provide this introduction of Gripus, with whom the previous action has not made the audience acquainted.

Now the removal of Sceparnio from the action, and the mechanical appending of Gripus for the purposes of the recognition theme, may well suggest that Plautus has combined parts of two distinct Greek plays;¹ and vss. 892-905, in which Daemones is so inartistically brought on and removed, may be Plautus' clumsy gluing of alien elements. But before any such supposition may become established fact or well-reasoned theory one must reckon with the situation that confronted the author of the Greek original; even the Greek author of the first three acts of the present play had to invent a character corresponding to Gripus. Once invented, it was difficult, in the nature of the plot, to make him an organic character; his connection with the main action, when he was first introduced, had to be loose; the mechanical introduction of Gripus in vss. 892-905 is indispensable to the needs of the audience, Greek as well as Roman, and, so far as it is mechanical, accords with frequent practice observable as early as Greek tragedy and Aristophanes.² Broadly stated, one is not

¹ So Miss Coulter, *Class. Phil.*, VIII, 57 ff., and cf. the references *ibid.*, 57, n. 4.

² The mechanical introduction of characters appears in the formulaic *καὶ μὴν ὁρῶ* (commoner in tragedy than in Aristophanes) and *ecce . . . video* with great frequency. Apart from the variations of this formula, note the obvious self-introduction of the parasite in *Bacch.* 573, and the patent address to the audience in *Poen.* 203-4, where both the young women are known to the characters on the stage and *haec est prior* carefully distinguishes the one from the other for the benefit of the spectators. The phraseology of introduction has been considered by W. Koch, *De personarum comicarum introductione*, Breslau, 1914; for incidental comment cf. Fraenkel, *De media et nova comoedia qu. sel.*, Göttingen, 1912, p. 59; Graeber, *De poet. Attic. arte scaenica*, Göttingen, 1911, p. 19; Flickinger, *Class. Jour.*, X, 207 ff. A study of introductions, as a phase of the technique of comedy, will shortly appear, I hope, by Mr. D. M. Key, of the University of Chicago. It will be observed that the postponement of the introduction in the *Rudens* to vss. 897 ff. immediately before Gripus' appearance may be a concession to the needs of an audience that is not provided with playbills.

likely to appreciate properly these supposedly abnormal features of the *Rudens* until he has fully considered in all the Latin plays, in the remains of Greek comedy, even in Greek tragedy, the conditions under which inorganic or loosely attached characters are employed in the drama, and the means by which such characters are related to the action. A study of inorganic rôles would reveal differences in degree, broad resemblance in kind; possibly a difference of degree in Gripus' case might confirm a theory of contamination; but safe conclusions can be based only upon a comprehensive study of the entire phenomenon, not upon casual observation of Gripus' rôle in the *Rudens*.

The *Persa* of Plautus is more obviously irregular than the *Rudens*. Operating with the same factors, largely, as do the students of contamination and retractation, but employing them to bring the date of the Greek original as near as possible to the time of Aristophanes and Euripides, Wilamowitz¹ has proved to the satisfaction of most modern students of comedy that the Greek model was a play of the Middle, not of the New, period. His argument from historical allusions is not relevant to my purpose; only his attitude toward supposed peculiarities of structure and character-treatment illustrates the tendencies of modern method which I am examining.

The play is primarily a slaves' play: a slave, plenipotentiary in his master's absence, intrigues against a slave-dealer; the slave-dealer owns the slave's sweetheart, a slave-girl; a second slave co-operates with the lover; a third slave, Paegnium, a *puer delicatus*, is loosely attached to the action to provide the comic byplay which relieves the general seriousness of the plot of intrigue. This general atmosphere of slaves temporarily liberated for the free exercise of their jovial and malicious propensities is very happily accentuated and preserved in the carousal which as an afterpiece follows the plot of intrigue elaborated in the first four acts; at this carousal the three slaves and the slave-girl sweetheart join in a triumphant convivial celebration in which the utter discomfiture of the slave-dealer reaches its culmination.

But the demands of the intrigue require two free citizens—a parasite and his daughter; for the plot involves the palming off

¹ *De tribus carminibus latinis* (Index lect., Göttingen, 1893-94), 13 ff.

upon the slave-dealer of a free woman as a slave. This pseudo-slave is to be ultimately claimed by her father, and the slave-dealer thereby put in jeopardy. The dramatist, in choosing a parasite and his daughter, has selected characters from the very lowest status of free citizenship, to that extent not entirely out of harmony with the servile status of the main characters, but as free citizens mildly disturbing the unity of atmosphere. This disturbing element is removed as soon as its necessary function in the intrigue is performed; they are needed only for the intrigue, and their activity accordingly ceases when the trick is played.

This mere statement of the poet's design, so far as realization may reveal the underlying purpose, should, in my opinion, meet sufficiently the objections of many modern critics.¹ They are disposed to insist that the parasite, who has been lured into active co-operation by the mention of appetizing foods and promises of perpetual feasts (vss. 140, 329 ff.), should be present at the concluding carousal. But clearly in the *Persa*, as in the carousal at the end of the *Stichus*, the presence of a free citizen would disturb the unity of a celebration designed to commemorate the emancipation, for the moment, of a group of slaves. The ancient audience was left to imagine that the parasite obtained his promised reward without dramatic realization of the feast that he had earned.²

¹ Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, 20 ff.; Meyer, "De Plauti *Persa*," *Comm. phil. Ienenses*, VIII, fasc. 1, 179 ff.; Miss Coulter, "Retractatio in the Ambrosian and Palatine Recensions of Plautus," *Bryn Mawr College Monographs*, X, 39 ff.

² Economic factors are often disregarded in modern criticism: the addition of the parasite to the final carousal would, perhaps, increase the number of actors required for the production of the play. Wilamowitz' distribution of rôles (*op. cit.*, 25 ff.) is not flawless: he has not provided for Sophoclidisca; and his division rests on the tacit presupposition that a vacant stage often marks an essential pause in Roman comedy (against which cf. Conrad, *The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy*, 1915); if the action is continuous at vss. 52 and 328, Sagaristio and Saturio may not be played by the same actor. The last two scenes show that at least five actors were required; the general structure indicates that the three heavy rôles of Toxilus, Dordalus, and Sagaristio each required a single actor; there remain five rôles, four of which are female or quasi-female (Paegnium) rôles, that might be distributed among two or three actors; the same actor might play Paegnium and the *virgo*; another actor might play Lemniselenis and Sophoclidisca (for, even if vs. 179 be assigned to the former, she need not have appeared on the stage); the only question is whether the parasite fell to a sixth actor (in which case he might have appeared in the carousal without increasing the number of the troupe), or was added to the parts played by the actor who carried the rôles of Lemniselenis and Sophoclidisca. Against the second

Wilamowitz is too familiar with the general weakness of comedy in respect to motivation¹ to lay much stress upon the defects in this regard of the amusing scenes in which the slave-boy, Paegnium, early in the play, is brought on the stage and elaborately presented to us in stationary lyrical scenes. The errands upon which Paegnium and the slave-woman, Sophoclidisca, are sent are quite futile, and serve simply as weak excuses for getting them upon the stage to amuse the audience and to lessen the seriousness of the more essential action.

Yet the general indifference of the comic poets to motivation does not prevent Wilamowitz and others² from finding serious defects in another shorter passage of the play in which the weakness of motivation is the most significant feature (as in the passage of the *Rudens*, vss. 892-905, discussed above). The intrigue in the *Persa* is completed in two chapters: in one, the arch-intriguer purchases his sweetheart from the slave-dealer with money borrowed from his fellow-slave; in the other (incidentally, to repay the borrowed money) he tricks the slave-dealer into purchasing the parasite's daughter, a free woman, but represented to be a Persian captive. The dramatic effect is enhanced by carrying out both chapters in uninterrupted succession, and the arch-intriguer remains on the stage dominating the situation (as, to a greater degree, in the intrigue of the *Mostellaria*) through both chapters (vss. 449-737). The parasite, who is needed only for the dénouement of the second chapter, in which he must appear and claim his daughter as a free citizen, is introduced to us before the beginning of the entire intrigue (vss. 329 ff.) and withdraws to the house of the arch-intriguer (vs. 399), where he remains in hiding

alternative stands the lack of harmony between the rôles of the parasite and the two women; in favor of it, stands the resultant economy and the structure of the play at vss. 305, 329, 752, 763; it may be that Sophoclidisca leaves at vs. 305 to assume the rôle of the parasite at vs. 329, and that the parasite leaves at vs. 752 to appear as Lemniacensis at vs. 763.

¹ *Op. cit.*, 22: "et intrant et exeunt personae plerumque soli poetae arbitrio obscurae, sin vero causam abundi proferunt, ipso silentio peior est" and in his commentary on Euripides' *Herakles*, vs. 701: "es gehört zum Stile des griechischen Schauspiels, die Motivierung des Gleichgültigen zu verschmähen, und zum Wesen des antiken Publikums, Adiphora als solche hinsunehmen und sich bei ihnen nicht aufzuhalten." Yet these interesting generalizations should be tested in careful studies of motivation in tragedy and comedy; cf. below, p. 144, n. 1.

² Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, 21; Goetz, *Acta soc. phil. Lips.*, VI, 300 ff.; Meyer, *op. cit.*, 172 ff.; Miss Coulter, *Retractatio in . . . Plautus*, 38.

during the whole of the first chapter and the greater part of the second. Thus for over 300 verses (vss. 399-726) he is entirely lost to view, and the scenic background, if he is within the house, provides no means for his observing the earlier progress of the intrigue and knowing when the time for his own activity approaches. The audience, too, may well have lost track of him in such a long interval; certainly he himself must in some way be informed that the time for his arrival on the scene has come. With this dramatic problem before him the poet—and I must insist that the Greek poet confronted the same problem—devised the very mechanical action at vss. 711-30. The slave-dealer must be removed while the parasite is brought on and admonished; unable to remove the slave-dealer artistically, now that the threads of the action are pretty well spun out, the poet simply drags him off at vs. 723, leaving the parasite's daughter on the stage (naturally the slave-dealer would have taken her with him into the house) because she is needed in the subsequent action, and as mechanically dragging him back again at vs. 731 (so *Daemones* was dragged on and off at *Rudens* vss. 892-905). These much-discussed verses (vss. 711-30), therefore, are the dramatist's way of solving his practical difficulties; and those difficulties inhered in the Greek plot. Yet modern critics are so impressed by the obvious mechanism and general weakness of technique that they ascribe the supposed abnormalities to the botchwork of a later retractor, or insist that Plautus must have made over, at this point in the play, a Greek plot which, in its legal aspects, conflicted with Roman procedure.¹ My own view is that the technique, however awkward, is explained so soon as we put ourselves in the place of the poet and the audience, and the Greek as well as Roman poet and audience.

¹ A legal expert (Partsch, *Hermes*, 45, 613) is not convinced by Wilamowitz' argument in this connection, and a layman finds it hard to believe that Dordalus is technically guilty under the circumstances. Is not the slave-dealer in jeopardy more because of a general prejudice against his class than because of any technical liability? As my colleague, Professor Bonner, suggests, without being technically guilty Dordalus would be embarrassed by legal action, and that situation suffices for dramatic purposes and makes unnecessary the precise legal procedure which Wilamowitz posits as determining the action in the Greek original. The fact that vss. 727-28 repeat vss. 467-68 is a textual problem; in both places an accomplice is warned of his approaching activity in the intrigue, and both couplets may illustrate only Plautus' fondness for repeating himself (cf. Kellermann, "*De Plauto sui imitatore*," *Comm. phil. Ienenses*, VII, fasc. 1, 155, note on *Persa* 2).

Rarely does modern criticism find in the portrayal of character any idiosyncrasy; but the peculiarities of the *virgo* in the *Persa* are used to support a view that the Greek original was specially exposed to the influence of the tragic poet, Euripides; the argument illustrates the strength, in the minds of modern critics, of what I shall in later discussion call the presupposition underlying the modern interpretation of Hellenistic and Roman comedy.

The characters of Roman comedy consist of stereotyped representatives of various trades and professions and slightly individualized domestic characters; they are in general realistic, but the realism of the portraiture is often modified under the stress of literary tradition or by immediate dramatic convenience. The choice of characters is determined by the inner necessities of the plot; in some instances external conditions seriously affect the selection. So, for example, the social conventions of Athenian life, combined with the rigidity of the scenic setting, which put the action of the plays in a public street and made interior scenes difficult, tend to eliminate from the comedies the respectable unmarried woman. The *Persa* is unique in its presentation of a *virgo* in an active rôle.

Now this abnormal feature might well excite surprise, and lead any reader to recall the heroines of Euripidean tragedy, were it not that the unique character is immediately explained by the conditions of the plot. The plot of the *Persa*, as we have seen, requires a free and unmarried woman who shall be palmed off as a slave; no woman of the higher grades of Athenian society would lend herself to such a purpose; the dramatist chooses one from the dregs of society, and even she demurs to the task imposed upon her. Under these circumstances, if the portrayal of character in comedy is primarily realistic, we should certainly expect to find in the parasite's daughter a person totally unlike any other woman in the pages of comedy. What parasites' daughters were in contemporary society we have no means of knowing, but the general conditions of life and social custom as they affected women in the status of free citizenship would point to a limited horizon, a very narrow outlook upon life and its problems, especially before marriage.¹

¹ Cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 71 ff., for the difference between the cities of Greece proper and those of the outside Greek world in this respect.

In noting in some detail the talk and behavior of the *virgo* we should remember that in the second of the two scenes in which she appears she has been taught a part (vss. 379-81). Such inconsistency as may be apparent between her seriousness in the first scene and her cleverness and apt repartee in the second is thereby explained: "necessitate me mala ut fiam facis" (vs. 382); even apart from this reasonable explanation of the slight contradiction, any dramatist in Hellenistic comedy is prone to abandon consistency of character if the immediate needs of the action are consequently advanced.¹

In the first scene (vss. 329 ff.), in language and manner strange to the reader of New comedy, who has become familiar largely with mercenary courtesans or irate wives, the *virgo* protests against the use which her father purposes to make of her. He is selling her to fill his belly (vss. 336-38); though poor, they should better preserve their good name than become rich at the expense of their reputation (vss. 344 ff.); Mrs. Grundy is a dangerous enemy (vss. 351 ff.). Her father retorts that his own appetite is the first consideration, and that the sale is not a real one; but she does not like even the pretense (vss. 357 ff.). The parasite resents wisdom in a daughter, and regards it as a weakness of her sex; the only weakness, she replies, is in letting evil action go unnoticed (vss. 365-70). She yields only to his authority as father, and points out that if the family gets a bad name her marriage will be difficult to arrange. The parasite, however, with a thrust at the evil times, declares that a dowry, not a good name, counts in marriage; and, reminded by her of his poverty, he finds in his stock of funny stories incalculable wealth sufficient to achieve her marriage even with a beggar (vss. 383 ff.).

In the second scene (vss. 549 ff.) she carries out her part in the trick with amazing cleverness. She comes on with a slave who poses as her attendant envoy from Persia; the two pseudo-foreigners are engaged in conversation as they enter. The attendant inquires whether she is not impressed by the splendor of Athens; she replies that she has seen only the external beauty of the town; the character of its citizens is still unknown to her, and she withholds judgment;

¹ Cf. Legrand, *Daos*, 309.

like a street-preacher delivering a diatribe she moralizes, lists ten deadly sins,¹ and declares a single wall to be a sufficient state of preparedness if the citizens are innocent of these sins, but a hundred-fold wall to be insufficient if a town is corrupted by such vices. The slave-dealer, considering the possibility of purchasing her, quizzes the *virgo*; her answers are ingenious; they satisfy the purchaser without committing her or her accomplices; she misrepresents her actual condition as daughter of the parasite in only one respect: she refers to herself as a slave, but otherwise every response fits her real situation as the parasite's daughter, with no little wit at the expense of the parasite for the audience to enjoy. She expects her parents to redeem her but does not object to a brief period of slavery (vss. 615 ff.); yet she weeps over her temporary plight. Dordalus inquires her name; it is Lucris, an auspicious name from his standpoint. Where was she born? Her mother told her "in a corner of the kitchen." Reminded that he means in what country was she born, she insists that she is without a country except that country where she happens to be; the past is gone (vss. 630-38); and pressed for an answer she contends that Athens must now be her country (vs. 641). Was her father a captive? No, not a captive, but he lost what he had. What is his name? His name is Miser and hers Misera.² What is his social standing? Everybody likes him, slaves and freemen, and she warns the slave-dealer that her father will ransom her, his friends will stand by him, even if he has lost his property. The slave-dealer is completely won over, of course too easily; the comic intrigue regularly represents the object of the intrigue as a gullible fool.

The entertainment and the dramatic effects afforded by the *virgo* are admirable, of their kind; in the first scene her modesty and idealism are in amusing contrast with the coarse practical wisdom of her father; and in the second scene she is contrasted implicitly

¹ If both passages come from the Greek originals of the two plays, anybody who is seeking the date of the Greek model of the *Persa* might well note that the ten *sodales* of *Persa* 561 are matched by the *sodales* of *Merc.* 845 (six in 845, ten in 848-49).

² Wilamowitz (*op. cit.*, 25) finds a Euripidean background in the answer of Orestes, when he is asked his name, in *Iph.* 500: τὸ μὲν δίκαιον δυστυχεῖς καλοῦμεθ' ἄν. Certainly the diction may be an echo of Euripidean phraseology, but the general idea in "nunc et illum Miseram et me Miseram aequom est nominari" is on the same plane with Gelasimus' "Famem ego fuisse suspicor matrem mihi" (*Stich.* 155).

with the slave-dealer, at whom her moralizing deals some sharp thrusts. The serious-mindedness which is her permanent characteristic is sustained, with advantage to the intrigue, in the second scene; her quick wit is perhaps foisted upon her to some extent by the dramatist for his immediate needs. The serious-mindedness, the moralizing, are the qualities of her class, affected by the secluded life of unmarried women in contemporary society; doubtless they are exaggerated for dramatic purposes, as are the qualities of the cook, the soldier, the courtesan, in comedy; but why need we turn to the tragic heroines of Euripides, rather than to real life, for an explanation of the *virgo*? Must she be a tragic heroine simply because she is serious-minded? And where in Euripides is such sustained prudishness to be found in the tragic heroine? The individual sentiments, to be sure, in content and phrasing may be like the sententiousness of Euripidean characters, but the influence of the tragic poet upon diction and style is pervasive throughout the Hellenistic period; the style of individual *sententiae* is hardly different from those that occur in the *Mercator* and *Trinummus*.¹

In brief, the inner necessity of the plot makes the *virgo* indispensable. Her essential features are those of the *virgo*, probably, in contemporary life, with some exaggeration; and though the character is required by the Greek plot, we must grant in this case the possibility that Plautus expanded suggestions in his Greek original with a view to portraying a staid Roman virgin from his own environment.²

¹ Cf. Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*³, 136.

² It is hardly fair to Wilamowitz to separate his confessedly weak arguments based on the technique of the *Persa* from the pivotal point of his discussion, but I wish simply to use the material to illustrate the general attitude of modern critics toward various phases of dramatic form in Roman comedy. On his main point, that vs. 506 presupposes an independent kingdom of Persia and dates the Greek original before 338 B.C., I may say that not merely the fictitious nature of the situation but the purely fabulous "Goldtown" which the Persians capture suggest to me a Utopian Eldorado rather than any accurate reference to contemporary history. I sympathize with the views of Meyer, *op. cit.*, 183 ff. (but not with his argument, *ibid.*, 186 ff.).

The logical relation of Leo's note on Diogenes (*Hermes*, 41, 441 ff.) to the argument of Wilamowitz should be thoroughly understood. Leo says that if Wilamowitz has proved his case, vs. 123 is a specific reference to Diogenes. On the other hand, it should be clear that if Wilamowitz has not proved his case, Leo's evidence, which is largely from Leonidas of Tarentum, probably a younger contemporary of Menander, would only establish the fact that at the time of the New comedy the equipment ascribed to the Cynic in vs. 123 ff. was attributed to Diogenes and other members of the school.

Leo's masterly analysis of the *Stichus*¹ has doubtless convinced many students of comedy. Certainly the extraordinary structure of the piece may be satisfactorily explained as a combination of parts of three Greek plays; these three parts might be called "The Faithful Penelopes," "The Discomfiture of the Parasite," "The Slaves' Carousal." The Roman play mechanically joins these alien elements by attaching to the first part a parasite, whose hopes of a dinner are twice frustrated in the second chapter, and to the second part a slave, Stichus, who arranges the revel with which, as in the *Persa*, the play concludes. That the parasite and the slave are inorganic rôles, that the play as a whole completely disregards unity of persons, are incontestable facts. The only question is whether such structure is inevitably Roman and Plautine. The modern critic denies that a Greek author, and particularly Menander, to whom a didascalie notice attributes the Greek original, was capable of this artless mechanism.²

There is only one fact in Leo's analysis which I should qualify. Leo maintains not only that the first appearance of the parasite, Gelasimus, is not motivated (vss. 155 ff.), but that his appearance before the houses of the brothers is in flat contradiction of an essential presupposition of the plot. Of course my own main contention is that it is idle to deal with the matter of motivation until this aspect of dramatic technique in its entirety has been properly studied, not only in comedy, but in tragedy. Accepting, however, for the

¹ Cf. *Nachr. d. götting. Gesellschaft* (1902), 375 ff.

² "Menander und Plautus schreiben beide für die Bühne, aber Menander aus einer grossen Kunstentwicklung heraus, Plautus für die kürzlich entwickelte Bühnenbedürfniss eines kunstfremden Publikums; ihm darf man die Umgestaltung Menanders auf gröbere Bühnenwirkung hin nach der Lage der Dinge wohl zutrauen" (*op. cit.*, 377). "Was die Form angeht, so liegt Menanders strenge und konsequente Kunst vor Augen; sie vor allem gibt den Massstab für die Treue der römischen Bearbeitungen" (*Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, I, 108). Such statements illustrate the broad vision of the critic, and if limited to Menander may be sound generalization. But the question arises whether the absolute uniformity of art here attributed to Menander may not have been violated, in at least one play, by an author who left over 100 comedies; modern critics seem to forget the enormous productivity of the comic poets in the Hellenistic period; how complete regularity may we expect in authors like Antiphanes, credited with 260 plays, Alexis with 245, Philemon with 97? Furthermore, in his critical studies of comedy Leo seems to regard all the Greek writers of comedy in the New period as issuing from a great "Kunstentwicklung," for clearly whatever is not "Kunst" in Plautus is, in Leo's theory, Roman.

moment Leo's standpoint, I should say that the implicit motivation of the parasite's appearance is strong.

The presupposition in question was not known to the audience at vs. 155, when Gelasimus first appears, unless it had been clearly stated in a prologue now lost to us. A modern reader has to reconstruct from vss. 214, 267, 372, 462, 584, 628, a very important fact: from these verses it is clear that the two brothers had been forced into their triennium of foreign travel by previous riotous living under the efficient guidance of the parasite; their commercial activity is an attempt to recoup their lost fortunes; the relations, therefore, between the parasite and the households of the two brothers are far from friendly during the action of the play. During the triennium the parasite has never been entertained at the homes of the brothers, and he is surprised that he, of all persons, should be selected as the messenger of one of the sisters and sent to the harbor for news of the absent husbands (vss. 266-68). Under these circumstances it is even more surprising that without any explicit reason he should voluntarily appear before the houses of the brothers at vs. 155; he arrives before the servant, Crocotium, can fetch him; and the futility, from a dramatic standpoint, of his function as messenger is immediately clear when in the next scene the news is actually brought by Paegnium, permanently stationed by the sisters as a lookout at the harbor. It is obvious that the author, Greek or Roman, wanted Gelasimus on the stage at this place and time, and lugged him on without any artistic manipulation of circumstances. Yet, if we are to regard motivation as essential in the dramatic art of the Greeks and Romans, I should suggest that the monologue of Gelasimus at vss. 155 ff. sufficiently explains his presence: he is reduced to starvation, and forced to sell all his scanty property; under these conditions where should he more naturally appear, as a last resort, than at the houses of the two brothers, where, in his palmy days, he had been a welcome visitor?

But this fact is merely implied, and I have no reason to question Leo's general conclusion that the handling of the situation is absolutely mechanical; both Gelasimus and Stichus are loosely attached to the action; they are in different degrees inorganic characters; and it may be remarked, in passing, that in only a slightly less degree

the parasite, Ergasilus, in the *Captivi*, from a comparison with whom Leo draws such important conclusions, is an inorganic character.¹

The reason for the existence of these two inorganic rôles (and the weakness, consequently, of Leo's entire theory that three Greek plays furnished the three chapters of the *Stichus*) is immediately apparent just so soon as we put ourselves in the place of a playwright who had devised the broad exposition of the first two scenes (vss. 1-154) as a complete introduction of a Greek play. For Leo admits that this exposition, with its contrast between the two loyal wives, and the further contrast between the two Penelopes and their father, is thoroughly Menandrian; nor is it demonstrably incomplete; he admits, too, that of the three Greek plays which he posits as furnishing the three chapters of the *Stichus* he can construct the plots of the last two but is absolutely unable to think out to the end the Greek play from which came the Menandrian exposition of the *Stichus*. Can there be any other conclusion, unless Menander's imagination was more fertile than Leo's, than that Menander himself, having constructed the exposition which we find in the *Stichus*, would be forced to develop inorganic characters and a relatively inorganic play as the result of such an exposition?

Given, as the exposition, two loyal wives separated from their husbands for a triennium, and urged by a practical father to assume that their husbands are lost to them and to marry again without further delay, what dramatic action can develop when these two husbands return and become reconciled to their wives and father-in-law? Leo is much disturbed that no visible reconciliation takes place, that the elaborateness of the exposition is not justified by any subsequent action; the sisters do not appear on the stage again after the exposition; the reunion of husbands and wives takes place off-stage; the reconciliation with the father-in-law is stated in the case of one brother, more visibly presented in the case

¹ For, however well explained his presence in the opening scene before Hegio's house, the relation of Ergasilus to the main action of the *Captivi* is so loose that Ladewig and Herzog long since suggested contamination or Plautine invention to account for the inorganic rôle; these suggestions have been long discarded; yet the difference between Ergasilus and Gelasimus is one of degree rather than of kind. The degree may be important, but its importance can be estimated only after a complete study of inorganic rôles in comedy, not after a casual comparison of the two parasites in the *Captivi* and the *Stichus*.

of the second. In brief, though all the facts of Leo's analysis might harmonize with the conclusion that the *Stichus* is a composite of three Greek plays, it is equally clear that the Menandrian exposition, if complete, would compel the Greek author to attach a character like the parasite to the first chapter of the action in order to provide the action of the second chapter, and if so trivial a character as Gelasimus were invented, nothing remained but the invention of a second inorganic character like *Stichus*¹ to give the play the requisite length, however much the unity of persons is thereby disrupted. There is nothing inevitable in Leo's conclusions; and if papyri from Egypt should ever confirm his conclusions, would it not be a tribute to his intuition rather than to the soundness of his argument?

Again, however, we are not interested primarily in the theory of contamination. Here, as in other plays, the critic has isolated as peculiar features of a single play certain supposed weaknesses; they are defects in motivation of entrance, in the organic relation of characters to action, and of exposition to subsequent dramatic development. Leo, to be sure, compares and contrasts the parasites of the *Stichus* and of the *Captivi*; but he had no complete study of any one of these three aspects of dramatic technique upon which to base sound conclusions. May I suggest, if only again by a single parallel instance, the need of less casual procedure in the handling of the technique of comedy?

A very important item in Leo's argument is the wastefulness, in the present text of the Roman play, of the admirable exposition, both of the general situation and of the characters, in the opening scenes of the *Stichus*. Quite apart from my suggestion that this apparently useless introduction and the inorganic action that follows are explained by the conditions of the exposition itself, there is clear evidence that the lack of close organic connection between exposition and main action is not peculiar to the *Stichus*, and is demonstrably Greek rather than Roman in its broad aspects.

¹ The mechanical inlay which Leo finds at vss. 419-53 and attributes to Plautus' efforts to attach *Stichus* to the action of the play might have been better in the original. If *Stichus* was really part of Menander's *Adelphoe*, the passage vss. 435-53 (vss. 446 ff. reveal Plautus' hand) may be a substitute for a lyrical intermezzo by the music girls (*haec* 418) in the Greek play; or so at least I should expect the many searchers after survivals of the Menandrian chorus in Roman comedy to suggest.

The *Mostellaria* of Plautus, from the Greek of Philemon, is admitted by Leo¹ to be thoroughly Greek in all essential features of the action; nor does he contend that any of the exposition is Plautine save the solo-song of Philolaches, which, he thinks, in the Greek original appeared as a monologue; of contamination the play is as innocent as any Roman comedy can be. The four introductory scenes of the play constitute the most elaborate exposition in extant comedy: in the first scene two slaves in dialogue reveal the general situation—the riotous life of a son under the direction of a slave in the father's absence; in the second, the son himself in song reveals his weakness of character; in the third, the young man's slave-girl sweetheart, now liberated with borrowed money, is sharply contrasted with an old beldam, her servant, and the effect is admirably portrayed in the changing moods of the eavesdropping lover; a fourth scene provides the general atmosphere of the whole situation—a boon companion and his sweetheart join the other pair of lovers in a brief, broadly humorous, lyrical intermezzo. Yet after this extended exposition of character as well as of situation the persons introduced to us in these scenes practically disappear for the rest of the action; Tranio, one of the slaves in the first scene, does become the arch-intriguer and dominates the later action, but the lover and his sweetheart, whose characters have been so fully delineated, are removed from the stage, and the subordinate boon companion, briefly presented in the fourth scene and at the beginning of the main action, is merely lugged on at the end of the play as a *homo ex machina* to cut the knot. The removal of the hero and the heroine, as we suppose them to be from the exposition, is cleverly devised; in the *Stichus* the wives are removed from the action only by the dramatic necessity, by the impracticability of developing dramatic action through their presence. But I should be disposed to assert that these expositions of two different plays supported a view that two Greek poets, Menander and Philemon, were so interested in character *per se* that they disregarded close interrelation of exposition and main action to indulge in the portrayal of persons essential to the situation but irrelevant to the subsequent action.

¹ Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, I, 110 ff.

As my choice of illustrations indicates, I am concerned only with those general aspects of the form of Roman comedy from which modern critics obtain their notions of the relation of Plautus and Terence to their Greek originals; these critics are intent upon the obvious and laudable task of reconstructing the history of ancient comedy, and of placing, not only Plautus and Terence, but the Greek authors whom these Roman playwrights translated, in their proper historical relation to one another and to antecedent comedy.

The problem that confronts these modern scholars, who, in view of the fragmentary remains of Hellenistic comedy, may well seem ambitious in their aims, is a difficult one. The plays of Aristophanes present an incoherent satirical burlesque, provided with a chorus as an organic part of at least the first part of the play, and lampooning public men, public policy, and the general trend of ideas and customs in contemporary Athens—a local product, instinct with the life of the Greek metropolis of the fifth century. The comedy of the Hellenistic period exists only in fragmentary form, through which the content is only vaguely discernible, the structure even more difficult to determine. The 26 Roman plays adapted from this Hellenistic comedy present a coherent drama of private life, of sentiment, and of intrigue, without a chorus, in which a generalized picture of contemporary society has replaced the fantastic treatment of local problems. How are these two diverse types of comedy related to each other, if related at all?

Ancient theory, expressed in a number of Byzantine documents, and perpetuating with later accretions academic opinion that may in some respects be as old as the school of Aristotle,¹ solved this question by the assertion that financial pressure led to the elimination of the chorus in Old comedy, that political conditions made impracticable the open criticism of men and events, the implication being that these two causes suffice to explain the development of an incoherent satirical burlesque into a well-organized realistic comedy of manners.

Making all allowance for the facts, that in some plays of Aristophanes the chorus falls into the background or almost completely disappears, that relative unity is occasionally discoverable even in

¹ Kaibel, "Die Prolegomena ΠΕΡΙ ΚΩΜΩΔΙΑΣ," *Abhandl. götting. Gesell.*, II/4 (1898).

plays in which the chorus is prominent, that in his latest plays Aristophanes made use of sentimental legend in which the exposure of a child and its recognition were essential features, modern criticism, with some reason, refuses to admit that ancient theory satisfactorily accounts for the sharp contrast in both form and content between Aristophanic plays and the extant comedies of Plautus and Terence. It asserts as an incontrovertible fact¹ that at the turn of the fifth century the younger Greek tragedy, represented chiefly by Euripides, exerted a potent influence upon the form and content of comedy, which, once the chorus was removed, took over the coherent structure of Euripidean tragedy and perpetuated without impediment the ideals that the tragic poet, hampered by the conventions of his literary type, could only faintly realize. Euripides, yearning to portray realistically contemporary life, must content himself with making of the demigod Orestes a very ordinary human being; Hellenistic comedy, free from the restrictions of tragedy, and relieved of the chorus as an organic element, easily conformed to a demand for realistic portrayal of private life and attained artistic unity. Roman comedy, therefore, reflecting the Euripidean form of Hellenistic models, reveals a serious framework of well-knit action, with comical appurtenances, and a happy issue; its artistic unity and much of its content are an inheritance from Euripidean art.

The features of Roman comedy which establish this fundamental presupposition are briefly these:² The plays are serious, the comic elements often detachable; remove the parasite from the *Captivi*, change the issue, a tragedy results. The emotions exhibited and excited by Roman comedy are, mainly, those proper to tragedy rather than comedy. The plot of intrigue is anticipated in several plays of Euripides. The exposure of children at birth and their later recognition is a tragic theme and situation. The intimate life and the domestic characters have little or no background in Aristophanes but are suggested in the tendencies of Euripides which Aristophanes delighted to ridicule. The plays of Euripides, in which the chorus is

¹ Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, I, 100 ff.

² *Ibid.*, I, 104 ff. For a comprehensive statement of the case from the standpoint of the historian of Greek literature cf. Christ-Schmid, *Gesch. d. griech. Lit.*, II/1³, 26 ff. References on the details are deferred to the fuller discussion of the theory in a subsequent paper.

often somewhat detachable, fall into six or seven coherent chapters, separated by choral songs; modern critics enjoy finding in the vacant stages of Roman comedy the deserted abodes of a tragic chorus, these empty spaces setting off well-defined chapters of action and distinguishing a general unity of form.¹ The most conspicuous feature of the technique of Roman comedy is solo-speech and solo-song; Euripides not only extensively cultivated solo-song by the actors, but more conspicuously than the other tragedians resents the impediment of the chorus, and on occasion puts in the mouth of a character a quasi-soliloquy in spite of the presence of the chorus, or rarely removes the chorus and resorts to monologue. Of these solo-speeches in comedy the prologues of many plays of Plautus, both in the style in which they set forth the plot and in respect to the characters in whose mouths they are put, are Euripidean. Aside from these essential elements of form and content Roman comedy in a variety of lesser features, in the use of various dramatic devices, in general sententiousness, in digressory moralizing upon social conditions and the proposal of social reforms, in attacks upon social groups, is supposed to reflect the technique and the substance of later tragedy.

Having thus confirmed the basis of its procedure by a substantial amount and quality of evidence modern criticism finds in the Roman plays, more conspicuously in the comedies of Plautus than in those of Terence,² striking exceptions to the uniformity of structure and content demanded by its Euripidean theory. The *Casina*, for example, is a broad farce.³ Various plays operate with inorganic

¹ Difficulties in the assumption that vacant stages in Roman comedy with any regularity mark essential pauses are indicated by Conrad, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

² The differences between the six plays of Terence and the twenty plays of Plautus have probably contributed largely to the development of the methods of modern criticism. Terence reveals a relative regularity in structure; Plautus has many vagaries. The younger poet is supposed to be more closely adapting his Greek originals; Plautus' vagaries are supposed to be Roman. But Terence is two-thirds Menandrian; may not his relative uniformity be merely the relative regularity of a single Greek author, and Plautus' variety, though sometimes Roman, in general the individual variations of a number of Greek playwrights? Modern interpretation of comedy is hampered, from my standpoint, by this concentration upon the uniformity of Terence-Menander; the diversity of Plautus may be the diversity of Hellenistic comedy in the large.

³ Mainly because of its farcical character and the preponderance of song the *Casina*, in modern theory, becomes largely a Plautine composition (Leo, *Geach. d. röm. Lit.*, I, 126 ff.). It is not clear how Leo would reconcile his two opinions that the songs

characters. The chapters of action are not always artistically joined. Entrance and exit are often weakly motivated, or not explained at all.¹ There are logical contradictions in the facts of the plot. Obviously, if the main presupposition is sound these irregularities and unevennesses must be explained in accord with the presupposition of general dependence upon Euripides. The explanation is found by the critics in two known conditions, one in the Roman methods of composition, the other in the transmission of the Roman texts. An accumulation of weaknesses in one play, especially a combination of two plots of intrigue directed to the same end and accompanied by contradictions of fact and related weaknesses of technique, is explained as due to the adaptation of two or more Greek plays in one Roman copy, to contamination. Isolated defects in various plays are justified as the result of corruption in text-tradition; these were promoted especially by the reproduction of Roman comedies in the generations after Plautus and Terence, such reproductions leading to the revision of the original text by the hands of stage-managers.

of the *Casina* are evidence of Plautine workmanship, and that the lyrical parts of the *Persa*, if Wilamowitz' view of the play is right, require us to consider "ob nicht auch im Original [i.e., of the *Persa*] mehr als bei Menander und Philemon gesungen wurde" (*op. cit.*, I, 120). Because of its complexity I have not attempted, in this brief account of modern interpretation, to state the relation of the problem of the cantica in Plautus to the historical development of comedy.

¹ The broader aspects of motivation in tragedy and comedy must be considered before one may estimate the significance of apparent resemblances between Euripides and the New comedy (cf. C. Harms, *De introitu personarum in Euripidis et novae comoediae fabulis*, Göttingen, 1914). Dramatists may independently develop similar methods of motivation. A stereotyping of dramatic devices may have arisen naturally at the dramatic festivals at Athens which would lead to resemblances in such features between tragedy and comedy without necessarily indicating predominant influence of one type upon the other. The rigidity of scenic background and the domestic setting which New comedy has in common with Euripidean tragedy might produce some common devices of motivation which would not, therefore, establish a theory of Euripidean influence. And finally, Euripides as the precursor of the Hellenistic period would naturally anticipate New comedy in many respects without any direct influence upon the type; so, for example, in the matter of motivating entrance by the emotion of fear (Harms, *op. cit.*, 28 ff.), note the general features common to all the tragic and comic poets, and the single trait which Euripides and New comedy have in common, the emotional exordium. Is this exclusively due to the influence of Euripides, or is it the emotional elaboration of the later epoch which Euripides anticipated? And if there is resemblance in the diction and style of this emotional exordium, is this kind of influence pertinent to a theory that Euripides at an early date determined the form and some of the content of New comedy?

The result of this modern theory and method is a certain neatness and dispatch in the interpretation of Roman comedy. Terence is admitted to be an artistic contaminator; the commentary of Donatus supplies the evidence. But in Plautus everything artistically satisfying is Greek in origin, everything defective and weak is Roman botching, whether of Plautus himself or a later Roman hand. This differentiation of the two dramatists is not at odds with what we know of the different nature and entourage of the two poets. Modern theory has progressed so far that now about one-half of the Plautine corpus is supposed to show the injurious effects of contamination; the scope of retraction is undefinable, affecting various plays in different degrees.

Either retraction or contamination is safely used to explain conditions in our texts when the critic rests his case on a substantial basis of evidence. For example, retraction is often solidly established when the text presents duplicate passages; but the critic enters upon more dangerous ground when mere weakness of technique starts the application of the principle. Contamination is a relatively sound explanation if the critic finds in a given play essential contradictions of fact combined with a double intrigue, each part of which is directed to the same end, and both parts of which are mechanically affixed to each other, as may be the case in the *Poenulus* and *Miles*. But I venture to protest strongly against the application of either principle, and against the presupposition of modern criticism, when they operate exclusively with supposed weaknesses of dramatic technique, or with any apparently abnormal features, that find immediate explanation in the conditions of the dramatic plot, in the needs and demands of the ancient audience, Greek as well as Roman, and in the peculiar arrangements of the ancient stage and theater or in the conventions established by known literary tradition.

The casual and incomplete treatment of large problems of dramatic technique in Roman comedy is due in some measure to the concentration of modern students upon the important questions raised by contamination and retraction; the narrowness of vision induced by such concentration is further increased by intensive studies of single plays which seem, to individual critics, to reveal the

effects of these two factors in the composition and the transmission of the Latin texts.

But even more effective than the consequences of this concentration upon a limited amount of text, and upon two distinct problems raised by the text, has been the fundamental presupposition which dominates the higher criticism of Hellenistic comedy and the Roman adaptations. The assumption, or, as modern criticism holds, the incontrovertible fact, that Euripidean tragedy exerted a potent influence upon comedy at the turn of the fifth century at once establishes a rigid norm and closes the minds of the critics to the possibility that many of the defects of form in Roman comedy are Greek in origin and natural survivals of the incoherence of earlier stages of the Greek type. Modern theory, in spite of its emphasis upon Euripidean influence, cheerfully grants that the Hellenistic type in many respects continues and develops important features of Aristophanic comedy;¹ the critics maintain simply that later comedy inherits more of the essential characteristics of one parent than of the other. Under these circumstances there are clearly other possible explanations: if the evidence warrants it, Hellenistic comedy may derive neither from Aristophanic comedy nor from Euripidean tragedy nor from the marriage of both, but from a different source which combined a relative unity of structure with characters and incidents inherent in comedy rather than tragedy; or it may be that later Greek comedy, like so many other Hellenistic types, was subject to a variety of influences, among which Euripidean tragedy is less significant than modern critics suppose. Certainly many aspects of Hellenistic comedy which resemble corresponding features of the later tragedy are sufficiently explained without resort to the contention that such influence was exerted overwhelmingly at the turn of the fifth century. Through mythological travesty, as the critics admit, tragedy influenced comedy at a much earlier period; later, the pervasive influence of Euripides upon Hellenistic poetry and the direct influence of the tragedian upon individual poets like Menander inevitably affected various Greek playwrights in different degrees. But this statement of the case is far different from a view that

¹ Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, I, 104 ff.; and (correcting the misapprehension of Süss) *Plaut. Forsch.*², 113, n. 2.

Euripidean art was so dominant an influence early in the development of Hellenistic comedy that a regularity of artistic form was established, deviations from which may be explained only as due to Roman corruption. If this presupposition without being entirely demolished is appreciably weakened, the foundations of modern interpretation are unsettled, the criteria of contamination and retractation are subject to revision, and the problems of dramatic technique must be regarded from a different standpoint.

In the next paper, therefore, I shall endeavor to review without prejudice the evidence bearing upon the antecedents of Hellenistic comedy. Obviously the interpretation of dramatic technique in Roman comedy must depend upon the conclusions of such a study if the evidence warrants positive conclusions.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ASSUMED CONTRADICTIONS IN THE SEASONS OF THE *ODYSSEY*

BY JOHN A. SCOTT

Professor Georg Finsler in his review of Rothe's "*Odyssee als Dichtung*," *DLZ*, August 15, 1914, p. 2058, lays great emphasis on the assumed fact that the later and earlier books of the *Odyssey* represent different seasons of the year and that accordingly they cannot belong to the same original conception. He argues that the assembly of the Ithacans, the journey of Telemachus, and the entire first four books have as their setting the warm weather of summer, while the story of Odysseus from his arrival at the land of the Phaeacians until his reunion with Penelope demands the cold and raw temperature of the late autumn or early winter. Professor Finsler bases these conclusions on the arguments already advanced by Wilamowitz in his *Homerische Untersuchungen*, p. 87.

If the Telemacheia demands the heat of summer and the rest of the poem the cold of late autumn or early winter, then there can be no assertion of the unity of plan and authorship of the poem, and the *Odyssey* must admittedly be the amalgamation of two stories of independent origin.

It is manifestly difficult to assign such poetry to definite months or seasons, yet the *Odyssey* presupposes a background in the seasons of the year, of which background there are several vague and one fairly definite indication.

The fairly definite indication is the following: When Odysseus went from the presence of Calypso and sailed toward the land of the Phaeacians, he guided his course by means of the following constellations and stars:

ε 272: Πλημιάδας τ' ἑσορῶντι καὶ ὀψὲ δύνοντα Βούτην
ἄρκτον θ', ἣν καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσιν,
ἣ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται καὶ τ' Ὀρίωνα δοκεύει.

Merry-Riddell in their edition computed the date on the basis of these stars as the autumnal equinox. Finsler puts it about two months
[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY XI, April, 1916] 148

later, saying in the passage mentioned above: "Die Hinweise auf winterliche Jahreszeit beginnen € 272, denn nur im Spätherbst sind Pleiaden und Boötes zugleich am Himmel sichtbar."

Professor Philip Fox, director of Dearborn Observatory, has very kindly figured with laborious accuracy the exact position of these stars from 900 to 700 B.C. His figures are for the latitude 39° N. This is the latitude of Smyrna, the assumed home of Homer, and the approximate latitude of Corcyra, the conjectural home of the Phaeacians. Since Odysseus sailed keeping these stars on his right, that is, in an easterly direction, we may presume that this latitude would not be amiss for the home of Calypso, as well as for that of Homer, Alcinous, and Odysseus. Professor Fox's conclusions are as follows:

After allowing for the procession of the equinoxes it is found that in 800 B.C., with a variation of less than two days per century for an earlier or a later date, the Pleiades were visible in lat. 39° N. from dusk to dawn, that is, all night, during the period extending from September 1 to November 2; also that Arcturus, the essential star of the constellation Boötes, set during the hours of daylight, that is, from dawn to dusk, except during the period extending from June 15 to October 21, and that accordingly the setting of Boötes could not have been observed during the period extending from October 21 to June 15. Ursa Major in that latitude is visible each night of the year and hence gives no indication of the season. If a sailor saw during the same night the Pleiades and the setting of Boötes, the latest possible date must have been October 21. At the latitude given and in the century named Boötes remained above the horizon seventeen hours, the Pleiades thirteen hours and forty minutes. The change in season of these stars since 800 B.C., because of the procession of the equinoxes, is about thirty-one days, so that these conditions now would fall about one month later in lat. 39° N., with a corresponding lengthening of the period as the observer moves north.

The fact that Boötes remained so long above the horizon, seventeen hours, seems to furnish the explanation of the phrase, "the late-setting Boötes."

If it was the setting of Boötes which attracted the hero's attention and if this setting could not be seen later than October 21, then it is impossible to assign this voyage to a later season of the year.

With the reliable indications furnished by these most competent and careful calculations I shall try to arrange a definite calendar for the *Odyssey*. Odysseus says that he sailed for seventeen days by the aid of the Pleiades and Boötes and that on the eighteenth day he saw

the land of the Phaeacians, and we may presume accordingly that he paid no further heed to the guidance of the stars; hence we must allow at least seventeen days for the help of the Pleiades and Boötes. Now the last day on which the setting of Boötes could have been seen was October 21, and so accordingly by allowing this utmost limit we shall fix the date of his leaving Calypso as October 5.

Taking this date, October 5, for our starting-point and agreeing with Professor Cauer that this is the twelfth day of the action of the *Odyssey*, we shall see whether or not it agrees with the other indications of the poem.

Professor Cauer in his *Beigaben zu Ilias und Odyssee* has arranged the events of the *Odyssey* according to the days of the action of the poem, whose scheme and figures I shall use as the foundation of my investigation. According to Cauer the events of the *Odyssey* occupy forty days, on the twelfth of which Odysseus sailed from Calypso. By substituting October 5 for the words "the twelfth day" we have the following calendar:

First day of the poem, September 24; on September 26 Telemachus and Athena-Mentor arrived at Pylos; on the evening of September 28 Telemachus and Peisistratus were in the palace of Menelaus in Sparta; on October 24 Odysseus was cast ashore on the land of the Phaeacians, and returned to his own Ithaca on October 28; Telemachus returned from his trip on October 30, and the events of the *Odyssey* concluded on November 2. These dates are gained simply by combining the latest possible date furnished by the proved calculations of astronomy with the scheme of the *Odyssey* already published by Professor Cauer. Do the events and indications of the seasons as suggested by the poem itself agree or disagree with this proposed calendar?

While the *Odyssey* is poetry and not accurate history observing minutely dates and seasons, yet if the conditions of climate, latitude, and seasons will stand this searching test, the arguments advanced by Wilamowitz and Finsler collapse, for they assume, in the words of Finsler, *DLZ*, August 15, 1914, p. 2058: "Wilamowitz hat aber gezeigt, dass wir an mehreren Stellen winterliche Jahreszeit vor uns haben, im Gegensatz zur Telemachie, die für ihre Reise notwendig den Sommer voraussetzt." That is, these two scholars assume the

summer season as the setting of the first four books and of that part of the fifteenth book which tells of the return of Telemachus from Sparta; also they suppose that the rest of the *Odyssey* belongs to the late autumn or early winter; while a calendar based on exact calculations and the impartial table of events furnished by Professor Causer assigns the events of the *Odyssey*, books i-iv, to the last week of September.

Ithaca lies south of lat. 39° N. and is practically due east of Palermo, or about 150 miles south of Naples, while the climate differs little from that of Corfu. Baedeker says of the climate of Corfu in his *Greece*, p. 252: "The temperature is mild and equable during October and the first half of November, but June (generally), July, August, and (often) September are very hot." The last week of September would then be just the season when the heat of summer has begun to yield to the coolness of autumn. There is but one suggestion in regard to the temperature in the first book, and that concerns the covering under which Telemachus slept; and he needed covering:

a 443: ἔνθ' ὃ γε παννύχιος, κεκαλυμμένος οἶδς ἄωτον.

The fact that this young man slept under a woolen covering or blanket shows that we are dealing, not with the heat of summer, but with the coolness of early autumn. The same observation would apply to the spring, but the later books of the *Odyssey* show that we have here, not the coolness of spring, but that of autumn, since the weather is growing colder and not warmer.

From Ithaca, Telemachus and Athena-Mentor went to Pylos, which has been identified with Navarino, the climate of which is thus described by Mr. Grundy in his *The Great Persian War*, p. viii:

During the four weeks I spent at Navarino the thermometer never fell below 93° Fahrenheit, night or day, and rose to 110° or 112° in the absolute darkness of a closed house at midday. What it was in the sun at this time I do not know. I tried it with my thermometer, forgetting that it only registered up to 140°, with disastrous results to my thermometer.

In the evening, when Telemachus started to go to his ship in order to spend the night there, Nestor was highly indignant, as if resenting the implication that he did not have sufficient covering for an extra bed:

γ 346: Ζεὺς τό γ' ἀλεξήσκει καὶ δῖον ἄνθρωποι θεοὶ ἄλλοι,
ὥς ἡμεῖς παρ' ἑμέω θοὴν ἐπὶ νῆα κίοντε

ὥς τέ τευ ἢ παρὰ πάμπαν ἀνείμονος ἢ δὲ πενιχροῦ,
 ᾧ οὐ τι χλαῖναι καὶ ῥήγεα πάλλ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ,
 οὔτ' αὐτῷ μαλακῶς οὔτε ξείνοισιν ἐνευδεῖν,
 αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ πάρα μὲν χλαῖναι καὶ ῥήγεα καλά.

The chlaena, as we learn from other passages to be quoted later and from the clever story told by Odysseus to get covering from Eumaeus, was used as a covering to give warmth and not as a mattress or pad to make a bed soft. If the weather were the summer weather described by Mr. Grundy, then these words about a bountiful supply of comforters and coverlets were intended by Nestor as a piece of dry humor, but if it be the season which I have assumed, then they are exactly suited to the night air of Pylos at the end of September.

When Telemachus and his companion, Peisistratus, started on their trip to Sparta, they whipped their horses, and their horses were so eager to go that they did not even rest at any period of the day, but kept right on:

γ 484: μᾶστιζεν δ' ἐλάαν, τὼ δ' οὐκ ἀέκοντε πετέσθην
 εἰς πεδίον, λιπέτην δὲ Πύλον αἰπὸν πολλοίεθρον.
 οἱ δὲ πανημέριοι σέβον ζυγὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχοντες.

During the long, hot days of summer they could not have traveled all day, but must have rested during the heat of the noon, and limited their going to the cool hours, if there were any cool hours, of the morning and evening. These verses show that the theory I am contesting was not founded on the *Odyssey*, but was an independent conjecture, a conjecture which ignored, not only the more difficult facts of astronomy, but the easily ascertained statements of Homer.

While in the palace of Menelaus, the young men were put to bed and snugly covered. The poet describes their covering thus:

δ 296: ὥς ἔφατ', Ἀργεῖη δ' Ἑλένη δμῳῇσι κέλευσεν
 δέμνι' ὑπ' αἰθούσῃ θέμεναι καὶ ῥήγεα καλά
 πορφύρε' ἐμβαλῆεν στορέσαι τ' ἐφύπερθε τάπητας,
 χλαῖνας τ' ἐνθέμεναι οὐλας καθύπερθεν ἔσασθαι.

The two adverbs ἐφύπερθε, καθύπερθεν prove beyond any question that part of this covering was to be put over them and that part of it was

to be put under them; hence it must have been fairly cool, and so accordingly could not have been the summer weather which these scholars assume.

To these positive arguments for assigning the Telemacheia to the autumn and not to the summer should be added the negative one that there is not a single reference to the heat of the sun, to the pleasure found in a cool shade, or to the necessity of rest during the heated hours of midday. In view of the extreme heat in these lands during summer the silence is most significant, and as Greek literature abounds in references to the pleasure afforded by cooling shade, it must be that the *Odyssey* demands a season of the year when that shade is not appreciated. It seems most likely that Nestor as he sat on the stone seat in front of his house (γ 411) was warming himself in the sun rather than cooling himself in the shade, since there is no mention of tree or shade.

The description of the method by which Odysseus guided his course has already been discussed, and it was assumed that he left the island of Calypso on October 5 and came in sight of the land of the Phaeacians on October 21. During these days the Pleiades would have been visible all night and the setting of Boötes would have been a prominent feature in the evening sky. The setting of Boötes could not be observed during the interval from October 21 to June 15. The Pleiades mark the early days of September as the earliest limit, and the setting of Boötes marks October 21 as the latest. That is in lat. 39° N. in 800 B.C. The change due to the procession of the equinoxes and also to the fact that Homer lived farther south explains the source of the error of the scholars mentioned, since the setting of Boötes in lat. 50° N. may now be seen as late as November 25, and the rising of the Pleiades has grown correspondingly later. This critic and his disciple assumed that there had been no change since Homer, and that Odysseus was sailing in the latitude of Leipzig or Berlin.

On October 23 Odysseus reached Scheria, the land of the Phaeacians. He was naked, and chilled by reason of his long exposure in the sea, yet even so he was in doubt whether to spend the night near the river or to seek shelter from the wind and protection from the cold in a bed of leaves. The fact that a heap of leaves kept him

snug and warm shows that we have the coolness of October rather than the severer weather of early winter.

When Odysseus came into the presence of Nausicaa on the following day he did not seem to be cold, even if he had no sort of clothing to protect him. This is to be expected, since even at the end of October the midday weather is mild in Corcyra. Toward evening, however, it began to grow cold, so that when Nausicaa returned to her room the obliging nurse, Eurymedousa, kindled a fire for her (η 7).

On October 28 Odysseus was once more in his native Ithaca, and he found at night that the weather had become raw and chilly, especially because of a bleak and piercing wind. The cold was not severe, since one chlaena was ample covering and the swineherd slept outside his cabin, taking with him only his chlaena and a fleece. The fleece seems to have served him as a protection from the hardness of his bed rather than from the keenness of the cold.

This coolness of the weather seems to have been a matter of indifference to Telemachus, so that with no extra clothing he started early for the city in the morning, while the infirm and ragged beggar preferred to stay by the fire until the sun grew warm. The coolness of the morning and the warmth of the day, when even a ragged beggar would be comfortable, agree perfectly with the conditions of the climate in Ithaca on the last day of October. This delaying until the heat of the day is a shrewd piece of poetic economy which explained to Eumaeus the unwillingness of Odysseus to accompany Telemachus to the city.

There are references to a fire in the hall of the palace in the following verses (τ 55, 64, 506); also the inference that warm covering was needed (υ 4).

The last books of the *Odyssey* assume a cooler season than that of the first four books, but there has been an interval of about five weeks since the first meeting of the Ithacans in their assembly. These five weeks were just sufficient to change the delightful days of late September, when a sleeper needed only a woolen blanket and when a team of horses had the spirit to travel during the midday hours, into the colder days of late October, when a poorly clad beggar preferred to spend his mornings by the fire. The first four books do

not fit into the summer weather and the last books do not fit into the winter weather of Ithaca.

Homer in all this is entirely consistent, and the forty days implied in the story of the *Odyssey* exactly correspond with the climate of Odyssean lands during mid-autumn, that is, from late September until early November. This is the clear indication not only of the *Odyssey* but also of the stars as seen in the time of Homer and from the lands of Homer.

It has already been suggested in this paper that the fact that Boötes is above the horizon seventeen hours daily may point to the meaning of the phrase, "the late-setting Boötes." In that case it is only a fixed epithet and has no reference to the actual observance by Odysseus of the setting of that constellation, just as the Cyclops spread his hands toward the "starry heavens" in broad daylight when no stars could be seen.

There is no night in the year when Boötes is not visible for several hours; hence it can give no indication of the season, if we regard the phrase "late-setting" as a fixed epithet. We are thus thrown back to the single consideration of the Pleiades, and they could have been seen during the entire autumn practically every hour of the night in the latitude and time of Homer. The stars watched by Odysseus give thus only a vague clue to the seasons and we must rely on the evidence of the poem independent of the stars.

The indications of the *Odyssey* point directly to the end of September for the opening of the poem, the beginning of November for its close. This assumption is favored by the position of the stars, whether we assume that Odysseus saw the setting of Boötes or that the words *ὄψε δύνων* are a fixed epic expression.

Professor Shorey suggested this second interpretation, an interpretation which is in harmony with epic usage and also renders impossible the assumed contradiction in the seasons of the *Odyssey*.

HORACE AN ATTICIST

By M. B. OGLE

There have appeared within the past year two articles¹ dealing with the stylistic doctrines of Horace as they are set forth in his *Sermones*, which are written from the same point of view, follow the same line of argument, and agree, with slight differences, in their conclusions. According to the one, Vergil and Horace, in their earlier poetry, at least, adopted the plain style because they were Atticists, members of the circle of Asinius Pollio, and exponents, therefore, of the stylistic theories of that circle. According to the other, Horace wrote the tenth satire of the first book with definite reference to the dispute between the Atticists, whose stylistic theories he upholds in this satire, and the Asiatics, including Lucilius, whose stylistic theories he combats, although Horace was not an extreme Atticist, but modified "the extreme views of the Atticistic school to which he belonged." Furthermore, Calvus and Catullus are mentioned in vs. 19 of this satire because "they are leading Atticists" with whose views on the points treated in this satire Horace was in complete accord, whereas Hermogenes and the *simius*, mentioned in vs. 18, represent the Asiatics; hence, the word *cantare*, vs. 19, cannot have the meaning usually given to it, but must be equivalent to "satirize," as in S. 2. 1. 46.

These views, supported as they are by the *auctoritas* of two such scholars as Professor Jackson and Professor Ullman, must receive, as they deserve, serious attention, but I am not, I must confess, Atticist enough, in spite of the *auctoritas*, to accept their conclusions without at least important modifications.

That Horace in S. 1. 10 sets forth his conception of satire and the difference between his conception and that of Lucilius, that he makes clear, also, his ideas of the style in which such productions

¹ Jackson, "Molle atque facetum," *Harvard Studies*, XXV, 117 ff.; Ullman, "Horace, Catullus, and Tigellius," *Class. Phil.*, X (1915), 270 ff. I have expressed my doubts about the validity of the conclusions of the former in a paper which will appear in *AJP*.

should be written, no one will question. The satirist, he says in effect (vs. 10 ff.), needs wit, which Lucilius had, but he needs *brevitas*, which he did not have; he needs invective, which Lucilius had, and geniality, which Lucilius did not have; he must sometimes play the part of the orator and the poet, which Lucilius did, sometimes that of the self-restrained gentleman, which Lucilius did not do. It does not follow, however, that, because Horace employs in this passage terms which are applied by the writers on oratorical theory to the bombastic style of the Asiatics on the one hand and the simple style of the Atticists on the other, he is expressly contrasting the two and explicitly stating his preference for the latter, or that he is on this account an Atticist and the critic of Lucilius because he, "compared with the higher standards of Horace's day," was an Asiatic. An argument based on the use of words is of doubtful value in any case, but especially so here, since Horace in his other discussion of the nature and aim of his work (S. 1. 4) uses these very same terms where they cannot have reference to the stylistic theories of any school; *comis et urbanus*, 1. 4. 90, *iocosus*, 1. 4. 104. It is a question, moreover, to my mind, at least, whether we ought not to confine the terms "Atticist" and "Asiatic," as we find them employed in the literature of the last century of the Republic, to the advocates only of certain stylistic theories which were formulated in connection with grammatical-rhetorical (oratorical) studies.¹ However this may be, Horace in this tenth satire makes it perfectly clear that he is not writing as the mouthpiece of any particular literary group, for in vss. 81 ff. he mentions among the real *docti*, who he hopes will approve of his work, Varius and Maecenas, who certainly, from the point of view of style, cannot be classed as Atticists. That his satires should be marked by the qualities of the plain style is certainly not surprising, since he takes pains to tell us (S. 1. 4. 40 ff.) that he is not writing poetry but prose in verse form, *sermoni propiora*, and *sermo* is, according to *Auc. ad Her.* 3. 13. 23, "*oratio remissa et finitima cottidianae locutioni*."² That this was the style which Lucilius employed Horace also makes clear; cf. S. 1. 4. 56: "His, ego quae nunc, / olim quae scripsit Lucilius, eripias si / tempora certa modosque, et quod prius

¹ Cf. Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.*, I (1906), 98.

² Cf. Morris' note on 1. 4. 42, and Ullman, *Class. Phil.*, VI (1911), 286 and notes.

ordine verbum est / posterius facias, . . . non . . . invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae"; 2. 1. 28: "me pedibus delectat claudere verba / Lucili ritu"; cf. 2. 1. 63.

These words tell us, as plainly as words can, that Lucilius, in the judgment of Horace, employed the style of ordinary conversation—the plain style, if we must call it so—and they should be sufficient evidence to refute the argument that Horace criticized Lucilius because his style was essentially that of the so-called Asiatics of Horace's day. Without this testimony of Horace, however, we should be in no doubt as to the position of Lucilius in the history of Latin style. We find applied to him, in the first place, in a work on style where we have a right to expect stylistic terms to be employed in their technical sense, the adjective *urbanus*, that shibboleth of the Atticists, a stock epithet of the plain style;¹ Cic. *De Or.* 1. 72: "C. Lucilius . . . homo . . . doctus et perurbanus"; cf. *De Fin.* 1. 7. If we say, as some² do, that Cicero, in using this term, is allowing his admiration to warp his judgment, and that in reality Lucilius was not *urbanus*—I am using the word in its technical, stylistic sense—then I fail to see how we can place any dependence whatever on ancient literary criticism; rather must we conclude, it seems to me, that if Lucilius' style had not been essentially that described by the rhetoricians as the plain style, Cicero, on whose testimony chiefly we have to rely for the definition of *urbanus* as a quality of this style, would not have employed the term. Cicero, however, is not alone in ascribing this quality to the style of Lucilius. According to Porphyry. *ad Hor.* S. 1. 10. 53, "comis autem Lucilius dicitur propter urbanitatem," and again, *ad S.* 1. 3. 40: "Luciliana urbanitate usus in transitu amaritudinem aspersit." Furthermore, no less an authority than Varro, as we learn from Gell. 6. 14. 6, made Lucilius the representative of *gracilitas*, meaning thereby *Χαρακτήρ ἁλχνός*; so, also, Fronto, p. 113, N. We know, moreover, that the stylistic code of the small group of orators known as Atticists represents a tradition³ of grammatical-rhetorical study which began with the circle of the Scipios; that this circle "was throughout under the

¹ Cf. Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 103; Jackson, p. 134; Ullman, pp. 287 ff.

² So Hendrickson, *Gildersleeve Studies*, p. 160, note, and p. 156.

³ Cf. Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.*, I, 100 ff.; esp. p. 102, n. 2.

influence of Stoic teachers from whom they derived their general attitude toward style—their sobriety and restraint and their aversion to rhetorical exuberance." The goal of this circle was *Latine loqui*, and they recognized "the conversational idiom as the only true and natural form of speech."¹ To this circle of the Scipios, Lucilius belonged, and he represented its ideals in his attacks upon the bombastic and turgid productions of the epic and tragic poets, and, I may add, in his ridicule of the excessive use of Greek words and constructions, both in ordinary conversation and in oratory.² He was, also, one of that generation of which we read in Cic. *Brut.* 258, giving the views of Caesar, "mitto C. Laelium, P. Scipionem: aetatis illius ista fuit laus tamquam innocentiae sic Latine loquendi, nec omnium tamen, nam illorum aequalis Caecilium et Pacuvium male locutos videmus." And the latter of these two poets, it should be noted, Lucilius attacked on that very ground; fr. 875 M: "verum tristis contorto aliquo ex Pacuviano exordio"; cf. Gell. 17. 21. 49: "et Pacuvius, et Pacuvio iam sene Accius, clariorque tunc in poematis eorum obtrectandis Lucilius fuit."

Here, then, arises, if we follow the argument of Professor Ullman, a curious situation. Lucilius, a member of the circle of the Scipios, and their representative in his writings, the satirist of the rhetorical exuberance and Greek affectation of his day, whom Varro selected as a type of the plain style, becomes sixty years after his death the idol of the Asiatics, who stood for every ideal of style which this circle and its offspring, the Atticists, despised. But "Lucilius was more or less of an Asiatic compared with the higher standards of Horace's day" (Ullman, p. 291, n. 3), and Horace attacks these Asiatics and "their idol Lucilius for their grandiloquent qualities—verbosity, savage invective, obscurity, impurity of diction, inurbane rhetoric, exuberance, turgidity, ineptness" (Ullman, p. 295). One wonders, if this is true, how Lucilius ever came to be admitted to the circle of the Scipios, or why Horace, "the Atticist," ever chose him to be his model, and made up his mind to write "Lucili ritu, nostrum melioris utroque" (S. 2. 1. 29); how he could call him *facetus* (1. 4. 7), an adjective which he applied to Vergil, "the Atticist,"³ in 1. 10. 44,

¹ Hendrickson, *ibid.*, pp. 101–2.

² Cf. Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

³ Cf. fr. 84 f., and the notes of Marx.

"emunctae naris" (1. 4. 8), and confess himself "infra Lucili censum ingeniumque" (2. 1. 75), or say, "neque ego illi detrachere ausim / haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam"¹ (1. 10. 48). One wonders, too, if Lucilius was an Asiatic in comparison with the standards of Horace's day how the Atticists could ever have claimed descent from the circle of which he was an honored member, how Caesar could have written as he did—cf. the passage from Cicero quoted above—and how the Atticists could have considered Plautus, whom Horace criticizes just as he criticizes Lucilius, and others of the earlier poets to whom Horace is not friendly,² models of pure *Latinitas*. The conclusion to which this argument brings us is not as clear as we should like.

Let us see, then, whether the matter is any better in regard to Catullus. He was a "leading Atticist," we are told, and because he was an Atticist employed the plain style in his shorter poems, at least, and also sets forth the reasons for the faith that was in him (cf. Ullman, pp. 292 ff.). Certainly Catullus, like Horace, employs the plain style in his shorter poems, but have we the right to call a poet an Atticist because in one department of his work, and this lyric poetry which tells the history of his heart, he uses simple and direct speech? How else wrote those old Greek poets from whom he drew his inspiration—Sappho, Alcaeus, Simonides? How else have written the greatest lyric poets of our modern world, Heine, for example, and Burns? Even if we refuse to recognize the claims of a poet's soul, we may recognize, at least, the claims of the department, claims which must never be overlooked in a discussion of ancient literary style. If Catullus' choice of a simple style was due solely to theory, what became of that theory when he set himself to translate Callimachus? or when he coins those bold words³ which we find chiefly in his longer poems but which are not wanting in his

¹ In view of this line, and for other reasons, I have never been able to accept the conclusion of Professor Hendrickson, *Gildersleeve Studies*, p. 163, that in the tenth satire "Horace's criticism of Lucilius is sweeping and uncompromising."

² Cf. *Ep.* 2. 1. 28 f., 170; *Ars Poet.* 45 f., passages in which he is clearly taking issue with the tenets of the so-called Atticists, especially their appeal to the *auctoritas* of the older writers.

³ Fondness for rare words was characteristic of the Alexandrian poets generally; cf. Ellis, *Comm. on Catullus*, p. xxx.

shorter lyrics, *buxifer*, 4. 13, *laserpicifer*, 7. 4, *pinnipes*, *plumipes*, 55. 17. 19? What must the real Atticist, Caesar, have thought of such words—he who said, “habe semper in memoria atque pectore ut tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum et insolens verbum” (Gell. 1. 10. 4)? If Catullus demanded brevity because he was an Atticist, what about Propertius, what about the Alexandrian poets, Callimachus, whose dictum, μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν, is echoed by Catullus, 95. 8, “parva mei mihi sint cordi monumenta sodalis,” Lycophron, Aratus? If Catullus avoided Greek words because he was an Atticist, what about Cicero, who in his speeches especially shows the same restraint?¹ If Catullus was *urbanus* in a stylistic sense in his satiric poems and *ridiculus* because he was an Atticist, what about Cicero, whose letters, yes, and whose speeches, show the same qualities? The importance of Catullus and his school for the artistic development of Latin poetry cannot be overestimated, and Horace should have acknowledged the debt which he owed them; but to say that Catullus and Horace wrote as they did because they were Atticists, because they were exponents of certain grammatical-rhetorical theories, is to do violence to the laws of logic and to disregard the claims of art.

Let us, therefore, put out of our minds the idea that Horace in the tenth satire is defending the theories of the Atticists, among whom he and Catullus and Vergil are to be enrolled, and attacking the Asiatics and their model Lucilius for their sins against the canons of stylistic (Atticistic) theory. Let us say, rather, that Horace is demanding the cultivation of clear and refined speech and, in the domain of literature, of suitable artistic form. This enables us to include with him, not only all the writers—we may except Maecenas—whom Horace calls his friends in S. 1. 10. 41 ff., but all the great Latin stylists of his own and the preceding generations. But Lucilius, we are now told, would not, in the judgment of Horace and his fellow Atticists, have had a place among them. He did, however, have a place in the circle of the Scipios, the cradle of the theories of the Atticists of later days, and this, we may be sure, would not have been the case had his literary ideals been different from those of its leaders, whom the Atticists revered as models of pure *Latinitas*.

¹ Cf. Weise, *Charakteristik d. Lat. Sprache*, p. 148; Norden, *Kunstprosa*, II, 193.

It is not, therefore, in the quarrel between the Atticists, represented by Horace and Catullus in their demand for a natural style, and the Asiatics, represented by Hermogenes and Lucilius in their advocacy of an unnatural style, that we are to find the explanation of Horace's criticism of Lucilius. As far, indeed, as the kind of style suitable for satire is concerned Horace agrees with Lucilius, and plainly tells us that he follows his master in the use of a style very close to that of ordinary conversation. Nor was the choice of such a style as the vehicle for the *sermoni propiora*, which form the subject-matter of Horace's *Sermones* as well as Lucilius' *Saturae*, dictated by their participation in any quarrel between rhetorical theorists. Lucilius adopted this style, and Horace after him, because the department as well as good taste demanded it, just as the New Comedy demanded it, just as the intercourse of cultured Roman gentlemen demanded it, just as the philosophical dialogue demanded it. This was the style which Ennius employed in his *Saturae*, if we may judge from what we know of their subject-matter. It is difficult, at least, to imagine that he told his fables—a characteristic of the department, as Horace shows—in the grand style. Nothing, indeed, could be *brevius, elegantius, urbanus, simplicius in propriis usitatisque verbis*, to quote a few adjectives from Cicero on the plain style (Or. 80), than the fable of the Crested Lark; and Gellius, 2. 29. 20, recognized it, for his comment is, "hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in satiris scite admodum et venuste versibus quadratis composuit," a comment which might well have come from a handbook on the plain style. If, moreover, Lucilius was free in his use of Greek words in his satires, we must remember that he criticized the use of them in other spheres, and we may conclude that in this matter, also, he was following a tradition of the department which crops up again in Varro.

With these considerations in mind we can easily understand Horace's criticism of Lucilius and the criticism of Horace by those who claimed Lucilius as their ideal satirist. Horace criticized Lucilius, not for all the faults set forth in the quotation from Professor Ullman, but first and foremost because he was *durus componere versus* (S. 1. 4. 8), because he lacked artistic finish. This includes *brevitas*, that "condensation of style which is secured by the selection of words that carry the meaning adequately" (Morris on

S. 1. 10. 9). On the same ground he attacks Plautus and Ennius and the older writers generally, thereby differing, as we have seen, from the real Atticists; he had been to school to the Alexandrians. In regard to Lucilius' use of Greek words, the criticism of Horace is hardly noticeable; he does not, indeed, attack him directly on this point as he does on the other, but he does attack the imitators of Lucilius, and also lays special emphasis on the necessity of avoiding Greek words in speeches, thus putting himself on the side of Lucilius and Cicero as well as on the side of Messala.

The only other ground on which Horace criticizes Lucilius is this, that he was bitter in his invective, in his direct personal attacks, in his outspoken abuse of public men, wherein he followed the writers of the Old Comedy. The rôle of political satirist was, of course, denied Horace, even if he had been inclined to assume it, and bitter personal attack was foreign to the refined circles in which he moved and repulsive to his own gentle nature. Hence he is careful to make clear (S. 1. 4 and 2. 1) that, although he follows Lucilius as his master in general, he does not follow him in his rôle of public prosecutor.¹ From this point of view S. 1. 10. 7 ff. is perfectly clear and may be paraphrased as follows: When one treats of such diverse subjects as find a place in the rambling discourse of Lucilius and myself, one needs to employ a diverse style; he needs to be *tristis*, certainly, severe in words and thought and style; that is, he must now and then play the part of the orator and the poet, but, like them, he must also be genial, even witty (*iocosus*) at times, gentlemanly and refined (*urbanus*), tempering the severe. Wit, you know, is more potent in many cases than severity. The poets of the Old Comedy realized this, although they are often severe and furnish Lucilius warrant² for his severity (compare what I said in my second *sermo*). And it is to this quality of genial wit (please notice the emphasis I lay on this point) that they owe their success. But I am talking about something of which you have no knowledge, for you have never read them. You get your idea of their style, you, Hermogenes, and you, you jackanapes—to give you a taste of your own medicine—from

¹ Cf. the fine analysis by Hendrickson, *AJP*, XXI (1900), 131 ff.; Morris' notes on S. 2. 1. 40, 47-56, 68.

² This is also the interpretation of Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

Lucilius, who follows them in their freedom of personal attack, or from Calvus and Catullus, who follow Lucilius in this matter.

That this is the proper interpretation of vs. 19 we see when we consider the criticisms leveled against Horace. What these were he tells us in S. 2. 1. 1 ff.: "sunt quibus in satira videor nimis acer et ultra/legem tendere opus; sine nervis altera, quicquid/composui, pars esse putat, similisque meorum/mille die versus deduci posse." To some people, then, Horace, or, if we follow Professor Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 132, Horace representing the abstract satirist, seemed to be too bitter (cf. the same use of *acer* in 1. 10. 14), exactly what he criticizes Lucilius for having been. These are the critics with whom he deals in S. 1. 4, men to whom "suspectum genus hoc scribendi" (65), who said to him, "laedere gaudes . . . et hoc studio pravus facis" (79), and charged him with being one "absentem qui rodit, amicum qui non defendit alio culpante, solutos/qui captat risus hominum famamque didacis" (81 f.)—objections which repeat vs. 34 of the same satire. The last charge, be it noted, is exactly that which by implication he brings against Lucilius in 1. 10. 7, "non satis est risu diducere rictum/auditoris." These critics of Horace, therefore, blame him for the same faults which he finds in Lucilius, namely, the violation of the "decent reserves of social intercourse by publishing his strictures upon individuals" (Morris' note on 1. 4. 34); to them, in short, he was not refined enough, not *comis et urbanus liberque*, 1. 4. 90, with which compare the *urbanus* of 1. 10. 13, and the *comis et urbanus* of 1. 10. 65. Clearly we are not dealing with the qualities of the plain style in the former passage. Horace's reply, given in the fourth satire, is that these critics are not consistent; that they admit that a man can be *comis et urbanus* in spite of the fact that now and then he will play pranks on a guest at a dinner, or talk too freely when in his cups (86 f.), but deny that a man can be *comis et urbanus* and indulge in the freedom of speech and the jests in which he indulges, vss. 103-5: "liberius si / dixero quid, si forte iocosus, hoc mihi iuris / cum venia dabis"; cf. the *iocosus* of 1. 10. 11.

To another class of critics, however, Horace seemed to be anything but *acer*. You are not bitter enough, they said to him, or personal enough to suit us, and verses such as you make anyone can spin out by the yard. Why don't you hale to court "primores populi

populumque tributim," as Lucilius did, and Calvus and Catullus? Why don't you give us some of the *triste*, the *acre*? These are the critics to whom Horace replies in S. 1. 10, and his reply is in effect: "Times have changed, social ideals have changed, and I am not writing to salt down the city. Lucilius is my master, yes, but he wrote too carelessly to suit me and I do not like his unrefined attacks on individuals. I shall try to write more carefully than he wrote; he himself would be more careful if he were alive today, and I shall adopt a more genial tone, and the result, I hope, will meet the approval of the most polished gentlemen of my day; what you may think of it doesn't bother me in the least."

If this interpretation is correct, it follows that not only can Calvus and Catullus be classified with Lucilius in regard to their view of satire, but they must be. It is satire of which Horace is writing, and especially satire as a weapon of personal attack, and if he criticizes Lucilius for being too *tristis*, for his "indifference to the claims of personal feeling" (Sellar, p. 234), what must he have thought of Catullus and his bitter and unrefined attacks? of such verses as "Ametina . . . ista turpiculo puella naso" (41), "Porci et Socratio . . . scabies famesque mundi" (47), "moecha putida . . . putida moecha . . . O lutum, lupanar" (42); cf. *putide Victae* (98), or of such poems as 29, 37, 54, and others too vulgar for polite society of our day as they were too vulgar for Horace? The distinguishing mark of them all is brutal invective, the presence of which in the writings of Lucilius, Horace condemns. This is one point, at least, of those discussed in this tenth satire, but it is the most vital point, in reference to which Catullus and Horace are decidedly not "entirely in harmony." That Catullus and Lucilius, on the other hand, were in harmony on this point a few passages from the latter's *Saturae* will prove; I cite from the edition of Marx, fr. 66: "homo inpuratus: et inpuno est ne rapister"; 75: "vivite lurcones, comedones, vivite ventris"; 493: "in numero quorum nunc primus Trebellius multost / Lucius, narce, saeva i febris, senium, vomitum, pus"; 1238: "O Publi, O gurges Galloni; cf. 413 f., and the evidence for his *obscenitas* cited by Marx, *Prol.* p. cxxxiii. In regard to Calvus, we cannot decide definitely owing to our scanty fragments, but the little that we have of his epigrams is strong evidence that in the matter of the use of

personal invective he is to be classed with Lucilius and Catullus and not with Horace. We know that like Catullus he made a violent attack upon Caesar, whom he calls *pedicator* (fr. 17 B), and on Pompey: "Magnus quem metuunt omnes, digito caput uno / scalpit: quid credas hunc sibi velle? virum" (fr. 18); and on Tigellius: "Sardi Tigelli putidum caput venit" (fr. 3). In the *putidum* of this verse Professor Ullman, p. 291, is inclined to see a reference to the "Asiatic tendency of Tigellius," but this would hardly apply to the *putida moecha* of Catullus; not, at least, in a literary sense. We must conclude, then, it seems to me, that in the open and vulgar ridicule of individuals, in this direct personal satire, Lucilius, Calvus, and Catullus were in complete agreement, and that Horace missed in their abuse of their contemporaries the self-restraint and subtle irony which pervade his own *Sermones*. He had begun his work¹ in their vein, and such a production as S. 1. 7 must have satisfied even those who made Lucilius their model, but the impulse did not last long, and in later years he could look back and laugh at these *tristes versus* (cf. S. 2. 1. 21) of his apprenticeship.

In the light of this interpretation of the attitude of Horace toward these three poets and their preference for the *acre*, bitter attack, to the *ridiculum*, genial fun—which is the only point discussed in vss. 1–19—vs. 19 itself is perfectly clear. Hermogenes and the *simius* have never read the *prisca comoedia* and hence do not know that it is characterized by the *ridiculum* as well as by the *acre*. They could not know this since their authorities are Lucilius, who imitates the *comoedia* in its *acre* but not in its *ridiculum*, and Calvus and Catullus who, in this matter, follow him, and are as brutal and unsparing in their personal attacks as he.² No recourse to irony is necessary, no violent

¹ Cf. the remarks of Hendrickson, *AJP*, XXI, 122. So *pus* in 1. 7.1 recalls Lucilius cited above.

² In view of Professor Ullman's suggestion, p. 276, that another point at issue between Horace and Hermogenes may have been the fact that the latter was a Stoic, it may not be amiss to note that as a Stoic he probably shared with his fellows their fondness "suo quamque rem nomine appellare," Cic. *Ad. Fam.* 9. 22. 1; he would, therefore, have found the poetry of these three men all the more to his liking. This practice was distasteful to both Cicero and Horace, and there is striking similarity between the former's advice to an orator concerning the use of the *ridiculum*, Or. 88, and the passage under discussion from Horace.

interpretation of *cantare* which is used in its ordinary sense as the frequentative from *cano*, just as it is used in S. 2. 1. 46, "insignis tota cantabitur urbe." There is, however, no unfavorable connotation, as Professor Ullman maintains, in the latter passage; it means simply, as Professor Morris puts it, that everyone will be repeating the satirical verses which Horace will write about him. It is exactly the same use which we have in Ovid, *Am.* 1. 15. 13: "Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe." From this point of view, also, it makes no difference whether or not we identify the Hermogenes of vs. 18 with the Tigellius of S. 1. 2. 3, and 1. 3. 3, although personally I cannot see why Horace is so careful to call the former Hermogenes unless he wished to distinguish them or, at least, to make their identity less marked. Let it be granted, however, that the two are, as Professor Ullman asserts, identical. Tigellius, then, was dead some years before this tenth satire was written, and since Hermogenes is clearly spoken of as living in this satire—there can be no doubt about vs. 90, hence no doubt about vss. 18, 80—the reference is not specific; Hermogenes, like most of the names in Horace, is not an individual but a type, and neither the friendship of the specific Tigellius for Octavius, nor his enmity with Calvus, need enter into the discussion at all.

The tenth satire, therefore, to sum up, was not written with definite reference to the dispute between the Atticists and the Asiatics, nor is it an attack upon the latter because they combated certain theories, concerning chiefly, if not solely, the style of oratory advocated by the former. Rather is it like the fourth, a statement first of all of Horace's idea of satire and of his relations to Lucilius. The latter was his master, and like him Horace wrote *sermoni propiora*, and in an easy conversational style suitable to the subject-matter and differing from prose only in its form. Lucilius, however, had two great faults: he was too diffuse, too careless of the artistic effect, and too brutal, too personal in his attacks on individuals; these two faults Horace made it his aim to avoid. These two satires serve, also, as replies to those who criticized Horace's idea of satire; in the fourth he answers those who charged him, or satirists as a class, with being too bitter in his attacks on individuals; in the tenth he replies

to those who complained that he was not bitter enough. To the latter, satire meant an unsparing arraignment of conditions and of men, and this they found in the open and often brutal invective of Lucilius, Calvus, and Catullus. They would not or could not realize that Horace was not writing *saturae* but *sermones*, and that he purposely avoided that feature which, owing to Lucilius, had become a marked characteristic of the old literary form known as *satura*.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

SOURCE-MATERIAL FOR JONSON'S *EPIGRAMS* AND *FOREST*

BY WILLIAM DINSMORE BRIGGS

No systematic attempt has ever been made to catalogue the sources of the *Epigrams* and the *Forest*. There are a few incidental remarks on the subject in Gifford's notes; the very useful observations in Amos, *Martial and the Moderns*, 1858, relate only to that poet, and even they are not exhaustive. The following pages, which do not pretend to complete the list of Jonson's borrowings, will be found, I hope, of some value. The passages taken from the poems of Jonson are given from the Folio of 1616.

I. *Epigrams*

Dedication.—In his dedication, Jonson, after some remarks addressed to the earl, protests that in composing his epigrams his intentions were perfectly innocent. So Martial, in the preface to Book I: "Spero me secutum in libellis meis tale temperamentum, ut de illis queri non possit quisquis de se bene senserit, cum salva infimarum quoque personarum reverentia ludant." Jonson then protests against the misinterpretation of his satire; Martial says: "absit a iocorum nostrorum simplicitate malignus interpret." At the end Jonson adapts to his own point of view Martial's passage concerning Cato: "Non intret Cato theatrum meum, aut si intraverit, spectet. Videor mihi meo iure facturus, si epistolam versibus clusero:

Nosses iocosae dulce cum sacrum Florae
Festosque lusus et licentiam vulgi,
Cur in theatrum, Cato severe, venisti?
An ideo tantum veneras, ut exires?"

Had Gifford observed that Jonson's use of the word "theatre" was taken from Martial, he would have been still more severe upon Oldys for talking of the dramatist as "master of a playhouse."

When Jonson says that many persons confess "so much love to their diseases, as they would rather make a partie for them, then be

either rid, or told of them," he is using a thought common in Seneca; see *Epist.* lxxxix. 19: "remedia ante vultis quam vitia desinere." For other Senecan parallels, see *Discoveries*, "Nullum vitium sine patrocínio," and Castelain's notes, p. 31 of his edition.¹ Jonson used similar words at the end of the fourth chorus in *Catiline*. On the avoidance of personalities, cf. the familiar passage from Martial, X. xxxiii: "parcere personis, dicere de vitiis," and the concluding part of Juvenal's first satire, 147 ff.

Epigrams i, ii, iii, iv: Note that in Book I of Martial, Epigram i is to the reader, ii is to the reader and about the bookseller, iii is to the book, and iv is to Caesar.

Epigram ii:

Become a petulant thing, hurle inke, and wit,
As mad-men stones: not caring whom they hit.

Jonson was not the first to use this figure; cf. *Anthologia Latina*, ed. Buecheler, I, 318: "In eum qui maligne iocatur:

Vtque furens totas inmittit saxa per urbes
In populum, sic tu verba maligna iacis."

And by thy wiser temper, let men know
Thou art not couetous of least selfe-fame,
Made from the hazard of anothers shame. . . .
He that departs with his owne honesty
For vulgar praise, doth it too dearely buy.

Here he seems to be thinking of Martial's sentence in his preface: "mihi fama vilis constet et probetur in me novissimum ingenium." Cf. VII. xii: "Et mihi de nullo fama rubore placet." For the phrase "catch the world's loose laughter" see the quotation from Horace under Epigram cxv below.

Epigram iv:

And such a Prince thou art, wee daily see,
As chiefe of those still promise they will bee.

Pliny, *Paneg.* 24: quales alii principes futuros se tantum pollicentur.

Epigram xiv:

Then thee the age sees not that thing more graue,
More high, more holy, that shee more would craue.

¹ Compare Livy i, Praefatio 9.

What name, what skill, what faith hast thou in things!
 What sight in searching the most antique springs!
 What weight, and what authoritie in thy speech!
 Man scarce can make that doubt, but thou canst teach.

Pliny *Epist.* I. xxii [in lamenting the illness of Titius Aristo]: nihil est enim illo gravior, sanctius, doctius, ut mihi non unus homo, sed litterae ipsae omnesque bonae artes in uno homine summum periculum adire videantur. quam peritus ille et privati iuris et publici! quantum rerum, quantum exemplorum, quantum antiquitatis tenet! nihil est quod discere velis, quod ille docere non possit. mihi certe, quotiens aliquid abditum quaero, ille thesaurus est. iam quanta sermonibus eius fides, quanta auctoritas, quam pressa et decora cunctatio!

Cf. also IV. xvii. 4: obversatur oculis ille vir, quo neminem aetas nostra graviolem sanctiorem subtiliorem tulit.

Pardon free truth, and let thy modestie,
 Which conquers all, be once ouer-come by thee.

Claudian *De Cons. Stil.* ii. 329:

Tandem vince tuum, qui vincis cuncta, pudorem.

Jonson has spoiled the conceit by changing "qui vincis" to "qui vincit." There is no particular point in Camden's allowing his all-conquering modesty to be overcome by himself. There is some point in Claudian's beseeching the all-conquering Stilicho to conquer, for the moment, his great modesty.

Epigram xviii:

To thee, my way in Epigrammes seemes new,
 When both it is the old way, and the true.

Martial II. lxxvii says that Cosconius objects to his way of writing epigrams because they are too long; but Cosconius should know, what he does not, that Marsus and Pedo (both writers of the time of Augustus) wrote long epigrams. So in VI. lxxv Tuca objects both to the meter of Martial's epigrams and to their length, whereupon Martial replies, "solet fieri, denique, Tuca, licet," i.e., it is the old way, and the true. In both of these pieces Martial rebukes his critics for presuming to find fault in matters whereof they are ignorant, and this is exactly Jonson's point at the end of this epigram.

Epigram xx [perhaps suggested by Martial II. xii. 3-4]:

Hoc mihi suspectum est, quod oles bene, Postume, semper:
 Postume, non bene olet qui bene semper olet.

Epigram xxvi:

Then his chast wife, though Beast now know no more,
He' adulterers still: his thoughts lye with a whore.

Seneca *De Cont.* vii. 4: si quis cum uxore sua tamquam aliena concumbat, adulter erit, quamvis illa adultera non sit.

Epigram xxxii:

His often change of clime (though not of mind).

Horace *Epist.* I. xi. 27:

Coelum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt.

Epigram xxxiii:

Thou art but gone before,
Whither the world must follow.

Seneca *Cons. ad Marc.* xix. 2: dimisimus illos, immo consecuturi praemisimus; *Ad Polyb. de Cons.* ix. 9: Omnibus illo nobis commune est iter: quid fata deflemus? non reliquit ille nos, sed antecessit; *Epist.* lxiii. 16: Cogitemus ergo, Lucili carissime, cito nos eo perventuros, quo illum pervenisse moeremus, et fortasse . . . quem putamus perisse, praemissus est.

Epigram xxxv:

Who would not be thy subiect, Iames, t' obey
A Prince, that rules by example, more than sway?
Whose manners draw, more than thy powers constraine?

Pliny *Paneg.* 45: et alioqui nescio an plus moribus conferat princeps qui bonos esse patitur, quam qui cogit . . . nam vita principis censura est, eaque perpetua: ad hanc dirigimur, ad hanc convertimur, nec tam imperio nobis opus est quam exemplo . . . et quis terror valuisset efficere quod reverentia tui effecit?

This passage was used by Jonson in a number of places. See the parallels collected in my article in *Anglia*, XXXIX, 215.

Epigram xli [this is on the model of Martial I. xxx]:

Chirurgus fuerat, nunc est vispillo Diaulus.
Coepit quo poterat clinicus esse modo.

Cf. also Martial I. xlvii.

Epigram xlii [this is an expansion of Martial VIII. xxxv]:

Cum sitis similes paresque vita,
Uxor pessima, pessimus maritus,
Miror, non bene convenire vobis.

And cf. Seneca *De Ira* III. 34: Quod vinculum amoris esse debebat, seditionis atque odii causa est, idem velle.

Epigram xliii:

When in my booke, men reade but Cecill's name,
 And what I write thereof find farre, and free
 From seruile flatterie (common Poets shame)
 As thou stand'st cleere of the necessitie.

Pliny *Paneg.* 1: tantumque a specie adulationis absit gratiarum actio mea,
 quantum abest a necessitate.

Epigram xlv:

Seuen yeeres tho' wert lent to me, and I thee pay,
 Exacted by thy fate, on the iust day.
 O, could I loose all father, now. For why
 Will man lament the state he should enuie?
 To haue so soone scap'd worlds, and fleshes rage,
 And, if no other miserie, yet age?

Seneca *Cons. ad Marc.* x develops the thought that all of our possessions, even our children, are merely lent to us by fortune (cf. *De Tranq.* xi and Cicero *Tusc. Quaest.* i. 39), whose debtors we are: "mutua accepimus . . . sic amare debemus, tamquam nihil nobis de perpetuitate, immo nihil de diuturnitate eorum promissum sit." In xix, xx, and xxii he discusses the advantages of dying early. See also *Epist.* xcix. 7: "quid autem dementius quam, cum idem tibi iter emetiendum sit, flere eum qui antecessit?" A similar train of ideas is characteristic of classical reflection; cf. Plutarch *Consolation to Apollonius* (on the death of his son; translation of 1870, i. 327):

We are not therefore to lament those who die in the bloom of their years, as if they were spoiled of things which we call enjoyments in a longer life; for it is uncertain, as we have often said, whether they are deprived of good or evil, for the evil in the world far exceeds the good. . . . We ought not therefore to take it amiss if they demand those things which they lent us only for a short time. . . . The gods have put life into our hands by a fatal necessity, and there is no prefixed time when what is so deposited will be required of us, as the brokers know not when their pawns will be demanded.

So Sophocles *Oedipus at Colonus*, trans. Jebb, ll. 1229 ff. For the same train of thought pursued from a satirical point of view, see Lucian *Of Mourning*, Fowler's translation, III, 216.

Epigram lii:

Covrtling, I rather thou should'st vtterly
 Dispraise my worke, then praise it frostily:

When I am read, thou fain'st a weake applause,
As if thou wert my friend, but lack'dst a cause.

Lucian *The Rhetorician's Vade Mecum*, Fowler, III, 228: And then do not wave your hand too much—warm approval is rather low: and as to jumping up, never do it more than once or twice. A slight smile is your best expression; make it clear that you do not think much of the thing.

So Pope's "Damn with faint praise," etc.

Epigram liv:

Chev'ril cryes out, my verses libells are;
And threatens the starre-chamber, and the barre.

Horace *Serm.* II. i. 47:

Cervius iratus leges minitatur et urnam.

Epigram lxiii.

With what thy vertue on the times hath won,
And not thy fortune.

Valerius Maximus VIII. xv. 2 [with reference to the elder Cato]: Magisque suo merito quam fortunae beneficio magnum.

And that thou seek'st reward of thy each act,
Not from the publike voyce, but priuate fact.

Pliny *Epist.* I. xxii. 5: recteque facti non ex populi sermone mercedem, sed ex facto petit.

Epigram lxiv:

But I am glad to see that time suruiue,
Where merit is not sepulcher'd aliue.
Where good mens vertues them to honors bring,
And not to dangers.

Pliny, *Epist.* V. xiv. 6: his ex causis ut illi sic mihi gratulor, nec privatim magis quam publice, quod tandem homines non ad pericula, ut prius, verum ad honores virtute perveniunt.

Epigram lxvi: The last two lines are almost identical with lines toward the end of *Catiline* III. ii; in a note on this passage Gifford has given the source.

Epigram lxvii:

Since men haue left to doe praise-worthy things,
Most thinke all praises flatteries.

Pliny *Epist.* III. xxi: nam postquam desiimus facere laudanda, laudari quoque ineptum putamus.

When, in mens wishes, so thy vertues wrought,
 As all thy honors were by them first sought:
 And thou design'd to be the same thou art,
 Before thou wert it, in each good mans heart.

Claudian *De Cons. Stil.* i. 49-50:

Taciti suffragia vulgi
 Iam tibi detulerant quidquid mox dedidit aula.

Epigram lxix:

Yet by thy weapon liu'st.

Doubtless to be explained by the "mentula quem pascit," of Martial IX. lxiii.

Epigram lxx:

When Nature bids us leaue to liue, 'tis late
 Then to begin, my Roe: He makes a state
 In life, that can employ it; and takes hold
 On the true causes, ere they grow too old.
 Delay is bad, doubt worse, depending worst;
 Each best day of our life escapes vs, first.
 Then, since we (more then many) these truths know:
 Though life be short, let vs not make it so.

The topic here discussed is touched on by Horace *Epist.* I. ii. 41 ff., and Martial has several epigrams dealing with it, such as I. xv; V. xx.

Jonson is, however, drawing from Seneca *De Brev. Vitae*; cf. iii. 5: "quam serum est tunc vivere incipere, cum desinendum est?" ix. 1: "Maxima porro vitae iactura dilatio est . . . maximum vivendi impedimentum est exspectatio, quae pendet ex crastino, perdit hodiernum." Then Seneca quotes the line from Virgil that Jonson makes use of (see Gifford's note). i. 4: "Ita est, non accepimus brevem vitam, sed fecimus"; i. 3: "satis longa vita et in maximarum rerum consummationem large data est, si tota bene conlocaretur" (i.e., if the whole of it be properly employed). The idea, "he makes a state in life," would seem to be derived from Seneca's comparison, in the same chapter, of the right or wrong disposition of life to the wrong use of wealth, whereby it may disappear in an instant, and the right use of small resources, whereby they increase. The idea, "ere they grow too old," is suggested by his remark that, though we do not realize that life is passing, yet we

realize that it has passed. There is, then, hardly a single idea in the epigram that may not be traced to this one tract of Seneca. The philosopher treats the same topic in *Epist.* xiii. 16-17, and xxiii. 9. Much the same ideas are introduced, occasionally the same language is employed. Seneca comments at some length on the line from Virgil in *Epist.* cviii. 25 ff.

The remark of Amos, p. 89, that the thought in this epigram was probably suggested by Martial VIII. lxxvii seems then mistaken.

Epigram lxxvi:

Of greatest bloud, and yet more good then great.

So in *Part of the King's Entertainment*,

Know greatest Iames (and no lesse good, then great).

Similar expressions are in *Epigrams*, cxiii, cxvi; *Forest*, xiii; *Underwoods*, xxxiii. The theme that virtue is the true nobility Jonson also handles in *Epigrams*, cix, *Forest*, xiv, *Underwoods*, lxiii, and *Eupheme*, No. VIII. In his collocation of "good" and "great," Jonson may very well have been thinking of such passages as Seneca *Epist.* xc. 4, where we are told that in the Golden Age, "summa felicitas erat gentium, in quibus non poterat potentior esse nisi melior"; *De Ira* I. xx. 6: "Nec est quod existimes verum esse, quod apud disertissimum virum Livium dicitur *vir ingenii magni magis quam boni*. Non potest illud separari: aut et bonum erit aut nec magnum," etc.; *De Clem.* I. v. 5; "Magnam fortunam magnus animus decet," etc. Satire viii of Juvenal is entirely devoted to the theme that virtue is the true nobility. See also Pliny *Paneg.* 21: "et hoc tantum ceteris maior, quod melior." Cf. Aristotle *Ethics* iv. 8, and the saying of Zeno (Diog. Laert., Bohn's transl., p. 267) "that excellence did not depend on greatness, but greatness on excellence."

I meant shee should be curteous, facile, sweet,
Hating that solemne vice of greatnesse, pride.

Claudian *De Cons. Stil* ii. 160-62:

Quin ipsa superbia longe
Discessit, vitium rebus sollemne secundis
Virtutumque ingrata comes.

Epigram lxxix:

That Poets are far rarer births then kings,
Your noblest father prou'd.

Jonson is here adapting the thought of the proverbial

Consules fiunt quotannis et novi Proconsules:
Solus aut rex aut poeta non quotannis nascitur,

which he quotes at the end of the *Panegyre*, and which he utilizes elsewhere, as in *Every Man in His Humor*, V, v—Poets "are not borne euerie yeere, as an Alderman"—and also in the dedication to Prince Henry of the *Masque of Queens*.

Epigram lxxxi:

Forbeare to tempt me, Provie, I will not show
A line vnto thee, till the world it know.

Cf. Martial I. lxiii:

Ut recitem tibi nostra rogas epigrammata. Nolo.
Non audire, Celer, sed recitare cupis.

Martial has several other epigrams dealing with plagiarism, as I. xxix, xxxviii, lii, liii, lxvi, lxxii.

Epigram xci:

Humanitie, and pietie, which are
As noble in great chiefes, as they are rare.
And best become the valiant man to weare,
Who more should seek mens reuerence, then feare.

Seneca *De Clem.* I. v. 4: Clementia in quamcumque domum pervenerit, eam felicem tranquillamque praestabit, sed in regia quo rarior, eo mirabilior; Pliny *Paneg.* 46: et quis terror valuisset efficere quod reverentia tui effecit?

Epigram xciii:

Then whose I doe not know a whiter soule,
Nor could I, had I seene all Natures roule.

Cf. Horace *Serm.* I. v. 41-42:

animae, qualis neque candidiores
terra tulit.

Epigram xciv:

Yet, Satyres, since the most of mankind bee
Their vn-avoided subiect, fewest see.

Jonson has here apparently Horace *Serm.* I. iv. 22 ff. in mind:

cum mea nemo
scripta legat volgo recitare timentis ob hanc rem,
quod sunt quos genus hoc minime iuvat, utpote pluris
culpari dignos. Quemvis media elige turba:
aut ob avaritiam aut misera ambitione laborat . . .
omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas.

For none ere tooke that pleasure in sinnes sense,
But, when they heard it tax'd, tooke more offence.

Apuleius *Apologia* 3: cum etiam hi, qui sibi delicti alicuius conscii sunt, tamen, cum male audiunt, impendio commoueantur et obirascantur.

This is the only poem of Jonson in which he repeats at the end the opening lines (with a slight variation); Catullus does so several times (cf. xvi, xxxvi, lvii), Martial occasionally (VII. xcii, and elsewhere), and various authors in the *Latin Anthology*.

Epigram xcv:

Mineruaes loome was neuer richer spred.

The allusion is not simply to the fact that Minerva was the patroness of spinning, nor to her contest with Arachne in Ovid *Met.* vi. 1-145. Savile is urged to write history, and Jonson compares the history that he might write with "Minerva's mighty mantle consecrated and embroidered," which was "an enormous piece of tapestry adorned with the actions and figures of the naval heroes and protecting deities. It was renewed every year; and was carried to the temple, at the Panathenaic procession, suspended and displayed from a tall mast fixed on a movable carriage. See Mr. Wordsworth's *Attica*, p. 184" (Frere's transl. of Arist. *Knights*, p. 129).

For who can master those great parts like thee,
That liu'st from hope, from feare, from faction free;
That hast thy brest so cleere of present crimes,
Thou need'st not shrink at voyce of after-times;
Whose knowledge claymeth at the helme to stand;
But, wisely, thrusts not forth a forward hand,
No more then Salvst in the Romane state!
As, then, his cause, his glorie emulate.
Although to write be lesser then to doo,
It is the next deed, and a great one too.

Sallust's *Catilina* III and IV [with the ideas somewhat rearranged]: Pulchrum est bene facere reipublicae; etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est; vel pace vel bello clarum fieri licet; et qui fecere, et qui facta aliorum scripsere, multi laudantur. Ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et auctorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum videtur res gestas scribere. . . . Igitur ubi animus ex multis miseriis atque periculis requievit, et mihi reliquam aetatem a republica procul habendam decrevi, non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium contere . . . sed a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem regressus, statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere; eo magis, quod mihi a spe, metu, partibus reipublicae animus liber erat.

In III and IV of the *Iugurtha* Sallust explains why he does not engage in public affairs, and remarks that if he writes the great deeds of former times "maius commodum ex otio meo, quam ex aliorum negotiis, reipublicae venturum." With the last two lines of the passage quoted from the epigram, cf. Cicero *De Or.* i. 2: "Quis enim est, qui, si clarorum hominum scientiam rerum gestarum vel utilitate vel magnitudine metiri velit, non anteponat oratori imperatorem?" And see the fragment of Plutarch usually called *De Gloria Atheniensium*.

Epigram xcvi: The phrase "with the better stone" seems a reminiscence of Martial IX. lii, "melioribus lapillis"; or perhaps rather of Persius Sat. ii. 1.

A man should seeke great glorie, and not broad.

Pliny *Epist.* IV. xii. 7: "etenim nescio quo pacto, vel magis homines iuvat gloria lata quam magna." Jonson's idea is that a man should seek *claritas* rather than *fama*; see the distinction between the two in Seneca *Epist.* cii. 11 ff.; in particular: "Deinde claritas non desiderat multa suffragia; potest et unius boni viri iudicio esse contenta, si nos bonos bonus iudicat. Quid ergo? inquit, et fama erit unius hominis existimatio et infamia unius malignus sermo? gloriam quoque inquit, latius fusam intellego: consensum enim multorum exigit." In the fragmentary *De Moribus* (Teubner, III, 462), Seneca says: "Non quam multis placeas, sed qualibus, stude."

Epigram xeviii:

And studie conscience, more then thou would'st fame.

Seneca *De Ira* III. xli. 2: Conscientiae satis fiat. nil in famam laboremus;
Pliny *Epist.* I. viii. 14: praeterea meminimus, quanto maiore animo honestatis fructus in conscientia quam in fama reponatur.

Epigram xcix:

Hast taught thy selfe worthy thy pen to tread,
And that to write things worthy to be read.

Pliny *Epist.* VI. xvi. 3: equidem beatos puto quibus deorum munere datum est aut facere scribenda aut scribere legenda, beatissimos vero quibus utrumque.

How much of great example wert thou, Roe,
If time to facts, as vnto men would owe?
But much it now auailles, what's done, of whom:
The selfe-same deeds, as diuersly they come,
From place, or fortune, are made high, or low,
And euen the praisers iudgement suffers so.

ibid. xxiii: Quam multum interest a quo quid fiat! eadem enim facta claritate vel obscuritate facientium aut tolluntur altissime aut humillime depriuntur. [After narrating an instance of remarkable wifely devotion, he continues]: quod factum ne mihi quidem, qui municeps, nisi proxime auditum est, non quia minus illo clarissimo Arriae facto, sed quia minor ipsa.

Epigram cii [the greater part of this epigram is made up from passages in Seneca and Valerius Maximus]:

Against the bad, but of, and to be [the] good:
Both which are ask'd, to haue thee vnderstood.

De Tranq. Animi vii. 5: Utraque enim turba opus erat, ut Cato posset intellegi. habere debuit et bonos, quibus se adprobaret, et malos, in quibus vim suam experiretur.

And scarce one knowes,
To which, yet, of the sides himselfe he owes.
They follow vertue, for reward, to day;
To morrow vice, if shee giue better pay.

Epist. cxv. 10: ad mercedem pii sumus, ad mercedem impii, et honesta, quamdiu aliqua illis spes inest, sequimur, in contrarium transitori, si plus scelera promittent.

A similar idea in Epigram lxxi has, as there pointed out, a different source.

But thou, whose noblesse keeps one stature still,
And one true posture, though besieg'd with ill
Of what ambition, faction, pride can raise.

The reference is to what Seneca says of Cato in *Epist.* lxxi. 8:

eadem enim virtute et mala fortuna vincitur et ordinatur bona. virtus autem non potest maior aut minor fieri: unius staturae est.

Whose life, eu'n they, that enuie it, must praise.

De Benef. IV. xvii. 2: adeoque gratiosa virtus est, ut insitum sit etiam malis probare meliora.

That art so reuerenc'd, as thy comming in,
But in the view, doth interrupt their sinne.

Valerius Maximus II. i0. 8 [speaking of Cato Uticensis]: Eodem ludos Florales, quos Messius aedilis faciebat, spectante populus ut mimae nudarentur postulare erubuit. quod cum ex Fauonio amicissimo sibi una sedente cognosset, discessit e theatro, ne praesentia sua spectaculi consuetudinem impediret. quem abeuntem ingenti plausu populus prosecutus priscum morem iocorum in scaenam reuocauit, confessus plus se maiestatis uni illi tribuere, quam sibi universo vindicare.

And they, that hope to see
The common-wealth still safe, must studie thee.

Perhaps we have here a reminiscence of the words used by Scipio Nasica in leading the senators against Tiberius Gracchus, Valerius Maximus, III. ii. 17: "qui rem publicam saluam esse uolunt me sequantur."

Epigram cix: Gifford and *D.N.B.*, s.v. "Sir Henry Neville," interpret the phrase "lent life" quite wrongly. The allusion is not to any danger that Sir Henry underwent, for in that case "lent life" would have to mean life lent by those who freed him from prison. Jonson, however, is merely expressing the classical doctrine, particularly the Stoic doctrine, according to which one's life should be regarded as a loan from the fates or from God, and one should stand ready to repay the loan at any moment. See above under Epigram xlv. The idea is common enough, and Gifford should have recognized it at once. Sir Henry's imprisonment, then, cannot be utilized as a means of determining the *terminus a quo* of this piece:

To be the same in roote, thou art in height.

Virgil, *Georgics* ii. 290-92:

altior ac penitus terrae defigitur arbos,
aesculus in primis, quae quantum vertice ad auras
aetherias tantum radice in Tartara tendit.

For the source of another passage in this epigram, see my article on "Cynthia's Revels," in *Flügel Memorial Volume*, 1916, 62.

Epigram cxv:

Being no vitious person, but the vice.

Martial XI. xcii:

Non vitiosus homo es, Zoile, sed vitium.

A good part of this epigram is founded on Horace *Serm.* I. iv. 81 ff.:

Absentem qui rodit, amicum
qui non defendit alio culpante, solutos
qui captat risus hominum famamque dicacis,
fingere qui non visa potest, commissa tacere
qui nequit: hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto.

But there are also hints from Seneca *De Ira* II. xxix. 4:

Hic ipse qui ad te detulit, desinet dicere, si probare debuerit. "non est, inquit, quod me protrahas, ego productus negabo, alioquin nihil umquam tibi dicam."

Epigram cxvi:

That Nature no such difference had imprest
In men, but every brauest was the best.

Sallust *Iugurtha* lxxxv [in the speech of Marius to the Romans]: Quamquam ego naturam unam et communem omnium existimo, sed fortissimum quemque generosissimum.

Several lines in this epigram seem to owe their origin to what Marius says in this part of his speech.

Epigram cxix: This contains a number of ideas from Seneca *Epist.* v:

illud autem te admoneo, ne eorum more, qui non proficere sed conspici cupiunt, facias aliqua, quae in habitu tuo aut genere vitae notabilia sint . . . sed non putemus frugalitatis indicium auro argentoque caruisse: id agamus, ut meliorem vitam sequamur quam volguis, non ut contrariam.

So Seneca tells Lucilius that he must not go to extremes in separating himself from the crowd: "Quemadmodum desiderare delicatas res luxuriae est, ita usitatas et non magno parabiles fugere dementiae," i.e., these things should be governed by judgment, not disease. Cf. also *De Tranq. Animi* vii. 4: "pro optimo est minime malus," though Seneca is there speaking of persons, not actions. Cf. *Fragment* xx: "Omnia, quae luxuriosi faciunt quaeque imperiti, faciet et sapiens, sed non eodem modo eodemque proposito."

Which is to liue to conscience, not to show.

Pliny *Epist.* I. xxii. 5: ornat haec magnitudo animi, quae nihil ad ostentationem, omnia ad conscientiam refert.

Epigram cxii [apparently modeled on Martial I. xxxix]:

Si quis erit raros inter numerandus amicos,
Quales prisca fides famaue novit anus,
Si quis Cecropiae madidus Latiaeque Minervae
Artibus et vera simplicitate bonus,
Si quis erit recti custos, mirator honesti
Et nihil arcano qui roget ore deos,
Si quis erit magnae subnixus robore mentis:
Dispeream, si non hic Decianus erit.

Perhaps this is the model for all of those epigrams of Jonson in which he first paints an ideal and then points out that this ideal describes the subject of the epigram; see Epigram lxxvi.

Epigram cxvii:

I know no abler way
To thanke thy benefits: which is, to pay.

This is Senecan doctrine, of course. *Epist.* lxxiii. 9: "interdum autem solutio [beneficii] est ipsa confessio." And see *De Beneficiis*, *passim*.

Epigram cxxxi:

When we doe giue, Alphonso, to the light,
A worke of ours, we part with our owne right.

Cf. Horace *Epist.* I. xx. 6, but more particularly Symmachus (Teubner ed.), p. 221: "Cum semel a te profectum carmen est, ius omne posuisti. oratio publica res libera est."

For, if the hum'rous world will talke at large,
They should be fooles, for me, at their owne charge.
Say, this, or that man they to thee preferre;
Euen those for whom they doe this, know they erre:
And would (being ask'd the truth) ashamed say,
They were not to be nam'd on the same day.
Then stand vnto thy selfe, not seeke without
For fame, with breath soone kindled, soone blowne out.

The point of view, together with certain expressions, recall Roman i. 4 ff.

ne mihi Polydamas et Troiades Labeonem
praetulerint? nugae. non, si quid turbida Roma

elevet, accedas examenque improbum in illa
castiges trutina, nec te quaesiveris extra.

Epigram cxxxiii:

The ox in Livie.

Livy I. vii gives the account of the theft of Hercules' cattle by Cacus.

My Muse had plough'd with his, that sung A-iax.

Judg. 14:18: If ye had not ploughed with my Heifer, ye had not found out my riddle.

II. Forest

Forest, ii:

Thy Mount, to which the Dryads doe resort,
Where Pan, and Bacchvs their high feasts haue made,
Beneath the broad beech, and the chest-nut shade; . . .
And thence the ruddy Satyres oft provoke
The lighter Faunes, to reach thy Ladies oke.

The mere mention of Pan, the Dryads, and the Fauns would mean little, but when Jonson refers to the revelry of these rural deities, we can hardly doubt that he has in mind lines from Martial IX. lxi:

Dumque fugit solos nocturnum Pana per agros,
Saepe sub hac latuit rustica fronde Dryas.
Saepe sub hac madidi luserunt arbore Fauni,
Terruit et tacitam fistula sera domum.
Atque oluere lares comissatore Lyaeo,
Crevit et effuso laetior umbra mero;
Hesternisque rubens deiecta est herba coronis,
Atque suas potuit dicere nemo rosas.

In ll. 25 ff. Jonson describes the land surrounding Penshurst as taking pleasure in providing food for its lord; cf. Virgil *Georgics* ii. 501-2:

quos rami fructus, quos ipsa volentia rura
sponte tulere sua, carpsit.

The "fat, aged carps, that runne into thy net," are marked by Gifford in his edition of Juvenal as from Satire iv. 69; in his Jonson he says nothing.

Where comes no guest, but is allow'd to eate,
Without his feare, and of thy lords owne meate;
Where the same beere, and bread, and selfe-same wine,
That is his Lordships, shall be also mine.

And I not faine to sit (as some, this day,
 At great mens tables) and yet dine away.
 Here no man tells my cups; nor, standing by,
 A waiter, doth my gluttony enuy:
 But giues me what I call.

See Martial III. lx, especially: "Cur sine te ceno, cum tecum, Pontice, cenem" (as noted also by Amos, p. 157), which may perhaps be the source of Jonson's reproach to Salisbury (*Conversations*, xiii). Jonson very possibly had also an eye upon the lively account in Juvenal v. 24 ff. of the different wines and breads eaten by *dominus* and *cliens*; at least, it is rather significant that he should single out wine and bread for comment and say nothing about meats. A passage in Lucian's *Saturnalian Letters* (Fowler, IV, 119) is worth citing:

Further let them [the rich] entertain us . . . more on principles of equality; let us all share alike. The way now is for one to gorge himself on some dainty, keeping the servant waiting about him till he is pleased to have done; but when it reaches us, as we are in the act of helping ourselves it is whisked off. . . . And pray charge the butlers not to make us call unto seven times, but bring us our wine when we ask for it first; and let it be a full-sized cup and a bumper, as it is for their masters. And the same wine, please, for every one at table; where is the legal authority for my host's growing mellow on the choicest bouquet while my stomach is turned with mere must?

In this connection Pliny *Epist.* II. vi is interesting.

Forest, iii: The first half of this, roughly speaking, seems adapted from Martial I. xlix, the second half from the latter part of Book ii of the *Georgics*. In neither case is Jonson slavishly imitating, but there are clear indications that he had both pieces in mind. For instance, note that Martial runs over the seasons of the year, as Jonson does, and that he condemns the life of the city, though in Jonson the order of the two topics is reversed. In Martial each season of the year will provide its appropriate occupations, hunting or other. The logs piled on the hearth recall the "*vicina in ipsum silva descendet focum*," and the rout of rural folk that come thronging in remind us of the

Vocabitur venator et veniet tibi
 Conviva clamatus prope;
 Lunata nusquam pellis et nusquam toga
 Olidaeque vestes murice.

As for Virgil, note that Jonson contrasts the happy life led by Wroth with the life of the soldier (with Jonson's lines on the soldier, cf. Tibullus I. x. 29-32), the miser, and the lawyer; *Georgics* 505 ff.:

hic petit excidiis urbem miserosque penatis,
ut gemma bibat et Sarrano dormiat ostro;
condit opes alius defossoque incubat auro;
hic stupet attonitus rostris, hunc plausus hiantem, etc.

Just preceding this passage Virgil has celebrated the Golden Age, as Jonson does. When in the earlier part of the poem Jonson speaks of securer rest, of polished pillars and gilded roofs, of lowing herds, of sleep under the trees, of the cool shade, and of rivers, he is utilizing ll. 460 ff.:

si non ingentem foribus domus alta superbis
mane salutantum totis vomit aedibus undam,
nec varios inhiant pulchra testudine postis
at secura quies
speluncae vivique lacus et frigida Tempe
mugitusque boum mollesque sub arbore somni.

Furthermore, the passage beginning

The whil'st the seuerall seasons thou hast seene, etc.,
with its mention of the sheep, the ripened ears, the furrows laden with their weight, the apple harvest, the hogs returned home fat from mast, recalls ll. 516 ff.:

nec requies, quin aut pomis exuberet annus
aut fetu pecorum aut Cerealis mergite culmi,
proventuque oneret sulcos atque horrea vincat.
venit hiems: teritur Sicyonía baca trapetis,
glante sues laeti redeunt.

In addition there are one or two other allusions worth noticing. "Unbought provision" is apparently suggested by "Et sua non emptus praeparat ova cinis," Martial I. lv, or the "leporem inemptum" of IV. lxvi, or the "dapibus inemptis" of *Georgics* iv. 133, or the "dapes inemptas" of Horace *Epode* ii. 48. The last is the likeliest, perhaps, as Jonson translated this epode. For life as a thing but lent, see above under Epigram xlv. With the passage

Let thousands more goe flatter vice, and winne,
By being organes to great sinne,
Get place, and honor, and be glad to keepe
The secrets, that shall breake their sleepe,

compare Juvenal iii. 49:

Quis nunc diligitur nisi conscius et cui fervens
Aestuat occultis animus semperque tacendis,

and Martial VI. 1:

Vis fieri dives, Bithynice? conscius esto.

With the usurer brooding over his wealth, cf., in addition to the passage above, the "incubasque gazae" of Martial XII. liii. 3 and Virgil *Aeneid* vi. 610:

aut qui divitiis soli incubuere repertis.
The rout of rurall folke
And the great Heroes, of her race,
Sit mixt with losse of state, or reuerence.
Freedome doth with degree dispense.

Cf. Statius, *Silvae* i. 6. 43:

una uescitur omnis ordo mensa:
parui, femina, plebs eques senatus;
libertas reuerentiam remisit.

Forest, iv:

Or, hauing scap'd, shall I returne,
And thrust my necke into the noose,
From whence, so lately, I did burne,
With all my powers, my selfe to loose?
What bird, or beast, is knowne so dull,
That fled his cage, or broke his chaine,
And tasting ayre, and freedome, wull
Render his head in there againe?

Horace *Serm.* II. vii. 68-71:

Euasti. Credo, metues doctusque cauebis;
quaeres quando iterum paucas iterumque perire
possis, o totiens seruus! quae belua ruptis,
cum semel effugit, reddit se praua catenis?

Forest, xi:

Not to know vice at all, and keepe true state,
Is vertue, and not Fate:
Next, to that vertue, is to know vice well,
And her blacke spight expel.

Plato *Gorgias* (Jowett, 3d ed., II, 364-65): He, then, has the first place in the scale of happiness who has never had vice in his soul . . . and he has the second place, who is delivered from vice.

And so, my dear sir, your way is open to a disquisition upon the two kinds of human love, the one sprung of a desire that is like the sea, outrageous, fierce, stormily rocking the soul; it is a true sea wave, which the earthly Aphrodite sets rolling with the tempestuous passions of youth; but the other is the steady drawing of a golden cord from heaven: it does not

scored and pierce and leave festering wounds; it impels towards the pure and unsullied ideal of absolute beauty, etc.

The doctrine is Platonic, but I find no passage in Plato so close to the one in Jonson.

He that for loue of goodnesse hateth ill,
Is more crowne-worthy still;
Then he, which for sinnes penaltie forbears.
His heart sinnes, though he feares.

Horace, *Epist.* I. xvi. 52 ff.:

Oderunt peccare boni virtutis amore.
Tu nihil admittes in te formidine poenae:
sit spes fallendi, miscebis sacra profanis.

Idem. Serm. II. vii. 72-74:

Tolle periculum:
iam vaga prosiliet frenis natura remotis.

Ovid *Amores* III. iv. 3-4:

Siqua metu dempto castast, ea denique castast;
Quae, quia non liceat, non facit, illa facit.

Seneca *De Benef.* IV. xiv. 1: Non immerito in numerum peccantium refertur, quae pudicitiam timori praestitit, non sibi.

Forest, xii (the opening lines seem to be an adaptation of Tibullus III. i):

Martis Romani festae venere kalendae
(exoriens nostris hic fuit annus avis),
et vaga nunc certa discurrunt undique pompa
perque vias urbis munera perque domos:
dicite, Pierides, quonam donetur honore
seu mea, seu fallor, cara Neaera tamen.
carmine formosae, pretio capiuntur avarae:
gaudeat, ut digna est, versibus illa meis.

Those other glorious notes,
Inscrib'd in touch, or marble, or the cotes
Painted, or caru'd vpon our great-mens tombs,
Or in their windowes; doe but proue the wombs,
That bred them, graues: when they were borne, they di'd,
That had no Muse, etc.

Gifford, of course, points out the familiar ode of Horace that inspired this part of the poem, but the lines quoted seem to be especially illustrated by Seneca *Ad Polyb. de Cons.* xviii. 2:

hoc enim unum est rebus humanis opus, cui nulla tempestas noceat, quod nulla consumat vetustas. cetera quae per constructionem lapidum

et marmoreas moles aut terrenos tumulos in magnam eductos altitudinem constant, non propagant longam diem quippe et ipsa intereunt: immortalis est ingenii memoria.

Forest, xiii:

And no man know,
Whether it be a face they weare, or no.

This is explained by *Catiline* II:

They say, it is
Rather a visor, then a face shee weares.

A Greek epigram by Lucilius was translated into Latin by Sir Thomas More (see *Florilegium Epigrammatum* [1629], p. 28; an English translation by Sir George Buck in the 1631 ed. of Stowe, p. 1085). It contains these lines:

Desine iam faciem stibio depingere totam,
Ne larvam, haud faciem quis putet esse tuam.

May they haue nothing left, whereof they can
Boast, but how oft they haue gone wrong to man:
And call it their braue sinne. For such there be
That doe sinne onely for the infamie.

Seneca *Epist.* xxviii. 10: Quidam vitiis gloriantur; *Epist.* cxxii. 18: nolunt solita peccare, quibus peccandi praemium infamia est.

Forest, xiv:

"Twill be exacted of your name, whose sonne,
Whose nephew, whose grand-child you are;
And men
Will, then,
Say you haue follow'd farre,
When well begunne.

See Cicero *De Off.* ii. 13. 44: "Nam si quis ab ineunte aetate habet causam celebritatis et nominis aut a patre acceptam, quod tibi, mi Cicero, arbitror contigisse, aut aliquo casu atque fortuna, in hunc oculi omnium coniciuntur atque in eum, quid agat, quem ad modum vivat, inquiritur et, tamquam in clarissima luce versetur, ita nullum obscurum potest nec dictum eius esse nec factum."

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY
June, 1915

THE INSTITUTION OF ATHENIAN ARBITRATORS

By ROBERT J. BONNER

Written evidence is inferior to the testimony of witnesses liable to cross-examination. No satisfactory explanation of the reason for the change from oral to written evidence has ever been advanced.¹ The plaintiff in *Apollodorus v. Stephanus*, a perjury case, remarks that the law required written evidence: *ἵνα μήτ' ἀφελείν ἐξῆ μήτε προσθεῖναι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις μηδέν*.² This statement does not necessarily mean that the sole purpose of the provision was to facilitate the punishment of perjury, for the practice was never extended to the *Blutgerichte*, where the consequences of perjury were likely to be more serious than in the other courts.³ In modern practice evidence is reduced to writing mainly for purposes of appeal. In Athens also appeals were based almost entirely on the affidavits presented at the arbitration.⁴ It seems quite plausible, therefore, to suppose that the real motive for requiring affidavits was to insure that the appeal should be taken substantially on the evidence as originally presented. Written evidence is fundamental in arbitration proceedings as described by Aristotle.⁵ Consequently the law instituting arbitration was either first enacted or radically revised when written evidence was introduced.⁶

¹ Both arbitration and perjury had occurred to me as probable reasons (*Evidence in Athenian Courts* [1905], p. 47). Leisi, *Der Zeuge im Attischen Recht* (1908), p. 87, does not suggest any special reason for the innovation but thinks it was introduced by litigants: "Allmählich mochte es sich für die Parteien als praktisch erweisen, den Wortlaut der Zeugnisse schriftlich zu fixieren, um das Plädoyer ganz genau auf sie einrichten zu können und vor nachteiligen Auszerungen besser geschützt zu sein . . . ob zuerst noch beide Modalitäten nebeneinander bestanden, oder ob das schriftliche Verfahren sogleich gesetzlich vorgeschrieben wurde, ist nicht zu entscheiden."

² Demosthenes xlv. 44.

³ Bonner, "Evidence in the Areopagus," *Class. Phil.*, VII (1912), 450; cf. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht* (1915), p. 883.

⁴ For exceptions see *Evidence in Athenian Courts*, p. 55.

⁵ *Const. of Athens* 53.

⁶ Leisi, *op. cit.*, pp. 85 ff.; Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 883; "Evidence in the Areopagus," *Class. Phil.*, VII (1912), 450, n.1.

According to the older view, public arbitration was introduced in the archonship of Euclides.¹ More recently the date has been pushed back into the fifth century because of the mention of arbitration by Andocides²: τὰς μὲν δίκας ὧ ἄνδρες καὶ τὰς διαίτας ἐποιήσατε κυρίας εἶναι, ὅπως αἱ ἐν δημοκρατουμένη τῇ πόλει ἐγένοντο. It is assumed that both public and private arbitral awards were reaffirmed by this enactment. But why should the awards of public arbitrators be reaffirmed? They were not final; the defeated party had the right of appeal. If he failed to exercise this right it was because he acquiesced in the decision. Accordingly there was no reason for expecting that there would be any general disposition to reopen cases settled by public arbitration. But private arbitrations were final; appeals were not allowed. Naturally the defeated party would welcome an opportunity for reopening the case. Thus the Andocides passage furnishes no proof of the existence of public arbitration before the archonship of Euclides. Furthermore, it is entirely improbable that arbitration was introduced under the democratic régime of the fifth century, though it was never more needed, for it would have materially lessened the amount of litigation and relieved the congestion of the courts. But one may very well doubt whether the ecclesia would have passed a measure that tended to lessen the activities of the popular courts even if a reformer was bold enough to propose it.³ The popular jealousy of any interference with the courts is seen in the success of Themistocles' charge that Aristides by his activity as a private arbitrator was subverting the popular courts as a step toward tyranny.⁴

The earliest certain references to public arbitration are subsequent to the Peloponnesian War. A law dealing with arbitration

¹ Pischinger, *De Arbitris Atheniensium Publicis* (1893), pp. 45 ff.; cf. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

² i. 88. In reference to the view that this passage proves the existence of public arbitrators before the time of the Thirty, Caillemer (Daremburg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, s.v. "Diatêtai") inquires: "Mais l'argument tiré de ce texte est-il bien probant?"

³ It is worth noting that Aristophanes, who has much to say about litigation, makes no mention of arbitration.

⁴ τῷ δ' οὖν Ἀριστείδῃ συνέβη τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπωμένῳ διὰ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ὑστερον φθονεῖσθαι, μάλιστα μὲν τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους λόγον εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐμβαλόντος, ὡς Ἀριστείδης ἀγγρηκῶς τὰ δικαστήρια τῷ κρίνειν ἅπαντα καὶ δικάζειν λέληθε μοναρχίαν ἀδορυφῶντων ἐαυτῷ κατεσκευασμένος (Plutarch *Aristides* vii).

is mentioned in a fragment of Lysias. In a suit to recover a sum of money (*περὶ τοῦ χρέως*) the defendant claims that he exhausted every means to effect a settlement without litigation, but in vain. The plaintiff constantly refused either to effect a friendly settlement or *δίαιταν ἐπιτρέψαι, ἕως ὑμεῖς τὸν νόμον τὸν περὶ τῶν διαιτητῶν ἔθεσθε*.¹ Schoemann,² contrary to the generally accepted view, argued that this law did not establish arbitration but merely extended its scope by increasing the amount that could be referred to arbitration. But why should the law have placed an upward limit on claims subject to arbitration? Amounts up to ten drachmas were exempt, not because it was not deemed desirable to have such claims settled by arbitration, but to prevent them from finding their way into court on appeal.³ But no consideration could justify the exemption of a case from arbitration on account of the largeness of the sum involved. Indeed, the larger the amount in dispute the more desirable it was to afford an opportunity for a compromise. There is even less reason for the view that this law was an amendment to the original law, extending it so as to include the kind of claim in question. The claim was for a sum of money (*περὶ χρέως*) and was based on a *συμβόλαιον*. This is precisely the kind of case that would lend itself most readily to arbitration. It is inconceivable that even a limited measure of public arbitration exempted a dispute regarding a debt. Unquestionably the reference is to the law that established arbitration. The speech cannot be dated, but it is not earlier than the archonship of Euclides.

A technical phrase (*μὴ οὖσας διώκειν*) always used of appeals from an arbitrator's award occurs in Lysias' speech against Diogeiton⁴ delivered in 401 or 400. The arbitration law, then, was part of the legislation enacted by the restored democracy between 403 and 400. At this time the Forty were organized in place of the Thirty: *οἱ καλούμενοι κατὰ δήμους*. Owing to the intimate relations between the Forty and the arbitrators it is more than likely that the two boards were instituted at the same time, if not by the same law.

¹ Lysias, frg. XIX (Thalheim).

² *Die Verfassungsgeschichte Athens*, pp. 44 ff.

³ Doubtless in these cases the Forty attempted to induce the parties to reach an agreement, thus in practice giving them the benefits of arbitration.

⁴ Lysias xxxii. 2.

This relationship was not accidental. The Thirty as originally constituted by Pisistratus were primarily arbitrators. For while they were empowered to give binding decisions on the merits of the cases, their chief function was to induce the disputants to reach a compromise: διὸ καὶ τοὺς κατὰ δῆμους κατεσκεύασε δικαστὰς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξήκει πολλάκις εἰς τὴν χώραν ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ διαλῶν τοὺς διαφορομένους.¹

The implication is that Pisistratus διαλῶν τοὺς διαφορομένους did precisely what the Thirty did. Regarding the functions of the Thirty rural justices instituted in 453 no information is available, but it may be safely assumed that they were essentially the same as those of the itinerant judges of Pisistratus.² When the board was reorganized under the restored democracy and increased to Forty, its duties were fundamentally changed. The arbitral functions of the original board were assigned to the arbitrators, a board instituted for this purpose. Hence the close connection between them and the Forty.³

Written evidence came into general use about 390, more than a decade after arbitration. But there is no objection to assuming that ὁ τῶν διαιτητῶν νόμος⁴ contained a provision requiring affidavits for all arbitration cases. The words καὶ ἀνάβητε τοῦτων μάρτυρες in the earliest case involving arbitration do not necessarily imply oral evidence, as expressions of similar import are found in speeches delivered long after all evidence was required to be reduced to writing.⁵ The other alternative is to assume a thorough revision of τὸν τῶν

¹ Aristotle *Constitution of Athens* 16. 4.

² *Ibid.* 26. 3; 53. 1.

³ In a paper entitled, "The Jurisdiction of Athenian Arbitrators," *Class. Phil.*, II (1907), 407 ff., I pointed out that, so far as citizens were concerned, only the cases that came under the jurisdiction of the Forty were subject to arbitration. Consequently neither the archon nor the thesmothetae sent cases to the arbitrators. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht* (1905), p. 228, reached the conclusion that the only cases involving property rights that were exempt from arbitration were the monthly suits (ἑμηνιοὶ δίκαι) which came within the jurisdiction of the εἰσαγωγεῖς. In *Nachträge und Berichtigungen* (1915), p. 981, he accepts my view so far as concerns the διαδικασταὶ κλήρου, which are much the most important cases that came before the archon. The considerations drawn from the evolution of the Forty from the Thirty rural judges afford additional confirmation of my theory.

⁴ Demosthenes xxi. 94. This comprehensive piece of legislation dealt with private as well as public arbitration (Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 221).

⁵ Lysias xxxii. 18; cf. Demosthenes xlii. 14: καὶ μοι κάλει τοὺς μάρτυρας δευρί.

δαιτητῶν νόμον in 390. The former alternative is to be preferred. In either case it is clear that the purpose in introducing written evidence was to facilitate appeals from the awards of arbitrators.

The extension of the practice to cases not subject to arbitration need occasion no difficulty.¹ Testimonial evidence was not of paramount importance in an Athenian trial. The facts of the case were developed by the speakers with or without corroboration of the details. Corroboration was always desirable but never essential. In modern practice the facts in the case must be presented entirely through the medium of evidence. Thus the disadvantages resulting from the presentation of evidence in an inferior form were outweighed by the accruing advantages, among which uniformity in practice, saving of time, and greater certainty in dealing with perjury are obvious.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ The words ἐνθυμῶσθ' ὅτι διὰ ταῦθ' ὁ νόμος μαρτυρεῖν ἐν γραμματεῖω κελεύει (Demosthenes xlv. 44) suggest that the practice was extended by law.

THE DATE OF THE LATERCULUS VERONENSIS

BY CLINTON WALKER KEYES

The list of the Roman provinces usually called the *Laterculus Veronensis* was printed in 1742 in Maffei's *Opuscoli Ecclesiastici*, but remained entirely neglected by classical scholars until it was rediscovered and edited from the original manuscript by Mommsen in 1862.¹ Since that time the question of the trustworthiness of the document and the problems in regard to the mysterious province Arabia Augusta Libanensis mentioned in it have frequently been treated, but the question of the date of its composition has not been investigated since Mommsen's original article. It seems very generally to have been thought that Mommsen had proved that 297 A.D. was the exact date of composition, and this year has sometimes been so far taken for granted as the proved date of the document that the mention of a province in it has been accepted as conclusive evidence that this province existed in 297.² In actual fact, however, Mommsen does not claim to be able to fix definitely the year of composition. After proving that the document must be dated between 296 and 342, he continues:

Es ist nichts im Wege und vieles spricht dafür, dass es unmittelbar nach der Einrichtung der neuen Diöcesen, im J. 297 oder bald nachher, aufgesetzt und eben nichts anderes ist als das nach dieser wichtigen administrativen Umgestaltung officiell in Umlauf gesetzte neue Diöcesen- und Provinzen-verzeichniss. . . . Auf jeden Fall ist das Veroneser Verzeichniss das älteste, das wir besitzen.³

Kuhn, in his attack on the trustworthiness of the *Laterculus*,⁴ did not question Mommsen's dating of the original document, but

¹ Mommsen, *Abhandl. d. Berl. Akad. d. Wiss.*, phil.-hist. Kl., 1862, pp. 419-518 = *Histor. Schriften*, II, 561-88. My references below will be to the *Histor. Schriften*.

² See, for example, R. Cagnat in *Mélanges . . . Huet*, 1909, p. 70: "Entre 295 et 303 les documents nous fait défaut. Hereusement la liste de Vérone nous fournit une date moins reculée: 297. . . . La division de la Numidie se placerait donc entre 295 et 297."

³ Mommsen, *op. cit.*, p. 587.

⁴ E. Kuhn, "Über das Verzeichnis der röm. Prov. aufgesetzt um 297," *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Paedag.*, CXV (1877), 697-719.

asserted "dass das Verzeichnis . . . die Aenderungen in der Provinzeinteilung von 297 bis gegen 380 zum grössten Teil in sich aufgenommen hat," and "dass das Veroneser Verzeichnis als ganzes betrachtet für irgend eine bestimmte Zeit als zutreffend nicht erachtet werden kann."¹ As far as I know the first expression of doubt as to the accuracy of Mommsen's estimate of the date was made by Mispoulet, who stated the opinion² that the document could not be dated before the end of Constantine's reign. He added that he was preparing an article in which he intended to uphold this view; but it seems never to have appeared. More recently G. Costa³ expressed the opinion that Mommsen's date was too early and Mispoulet's too late. He did not discuss the question further, but said that his treatment of the epigraphical evidence for the provincial government of Diocletian might throw some light on the subject. In this I believe he was right, as will appear below.

What I wish to do in this paper is to attempt to fix the date of the Laterculus as closely as possible by the use of evidence which has become available since the time of Mommsen's article.

Mommsen found indications in the document itself which seemed to him to point to the reign of Diocletian. His most convincing arguments were drawn from the names of Egyptian, Pontic, and Numidian provinces, and these are the only parts of the empire which we need to consider here, as they give us our only good evidence as to the date of the Laterculus.

EGYPT

The former imperial domain of Egypt was divided into three provinces at the time of the Laterculus: Thebais, Aegyptus Iovia, and Aegyptus Herculia.⁴ The names of two of these provinces obviously refer to the titles Iovius and Herculus assumed by Diocletian and Maximian. At the time of Mommsen's article the names

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 701. Kuhn's theory has been refuted by C. Cswalina, "Über das Verzeichnis der röm. Prov. vom J. 297," *Progr. Wesel*, 1881, and W. Ohnesorge, "Die röm. Provinzialiste von 297," Teil I, *Progr. Duisburg*, 1889. Mommsen's view that the only interpolations are the obvious ones mentioned by him, *op. cit.*, p. 576, seems now to be generally accepted.

² *Acad. des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres, Comptes rendus*, 1908, p. 255.

³ De Ruggiero, *Dis. Epigr.*, II, 1833.

⁴ Cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 571-72.

of these two provinces were found only in the Veronese list. Now we have evidence from the papyri for governors of Aegyptus Herculia in 316 and 322.¹ Our earliest evidence for the province Thebais seems to be the governorship of Satrius Arrianus in 307.² The first change from the arrangement of the Egyptian provinces given in the Laterculus, as far as we know, was the formation of the province of Augustamnica, which occurred in 341.³ Thus the evidence from Egypt shows us merely that the Laterculus cannot be dated after 341. In fact, there is no actual evidence that any of these three Egyptian provinces existed in the reign of Diocletian at all; it is perfectly possible that they were formed after his abdication, and that two of them were then named after the two retired Augusti.

PONTUS

The name of the province Diospontus may also refer to Diocletian's title Iovius. The province was later named Helenopontus after Constantine's mother.⁴ The epigraphical evidence in regard to the matter is as follows:

	Date	Reference	Governor's Name and Title
I.....	293/305	<i>CIL</i> , III, 307, 13643, 14184 ^u , 14184 ^v , 14184 ^w ; <i>AJA</i> , IX (1905), p. 328 = <i>L'An. Épigr.</i> , 1906, N. 2.	Aur. Priscianus v.p. praes. prov. Ponti
II.....	317/23	<i>CIL</i> , III, 14184 ^u = <i>JHS</i> , XX (1900), p. 164	Val. CIIPVS—VR v.p. praes. provinc. Diospont[i]
III.....	333/37	<i>CIL</i> , III, 14187 ^u , 14187 ^v	Fl. Iul. Leontius praes. pr. {Hecnop. } (=Helenoponti)

I shows that Pontus was not divided before 293. How much later in the reign of Diocletian this governor comes we cannot tell. There is no evidence whatever for the division of the province or the existence of the name Diospontus during Diocletian's reign.

¹ Pap. Oxyr., VI, 896, 28; Pap. Theadelph. (ed. Jouguet), 13, 11. Cf. Pap. Theadelph. 19, 1.

² Grenfell and Hunt, *Gr. Pap.*, II (1897), 78, 1; cf. Pap. Flor., I, 33, 9.

³ E. Schwartz, "Zur Gesch. des Athanasius," *Nachrichten d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Kl., 1904, p. 354; cf. M. Gelzer, *Stud. zur byzant. Verw. Ägyptens*. Diss. Leipzig, 1909, pp. 5 f.

⁴ Cf. Mommsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 575, 586, 587.

II, which mentions Diospontus, shows that the name Helenopontus was not given to the province before 317 at the earliest, for it was called Diospontus at least up to that date.

III shows the existence of the title Helenopontus in the last years of Constantine. The province would hardly have been named after Constantine's mother before she became Augusta, which probably occurred in 325. Perhaps this change of name is to be connected with the foundation of Helenopolis (= Drepana) in Bithynia in 327.¹

The evidence from Pontus, then, gives us no reason for connecting the Veronese list with the reign of Diocletian rather than with that of Constantine. It merely proves that the list must have been drawn up before the end of Constantine's reign in 337.

NUMIDIA

In the large number of inscriptions containing the names of governors of Numidia we find evidence which enables us to date the Veronese list more closely. A list of the governors of that province from 303 to 314 follows:

	Date	Reference	Governor's Name and Title
I.	November 20, 303	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 4764 = 18698	—regente p. N. vestra. Aurel. Quintiano v.p.
II.	304	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 2345, 2346. Cf. 4334	Valerius Florus v.p. p.p. N.M.
		<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 6700 = 19353	—marturum qui sunt passi sub preside Floro in civitate Milevitana in diebus turificationis
III.	305-6	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 4766 = 18700 (Diocletian)	Val Ant[oninus] v.p. p.p. N.C.]
		<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 5526 = 18860 (a. 306)	P Val [A]nton[inus p.p.] N.C.
		<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 7965	Valerius Antoninus v.p. p. N.C.
		<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 7067	Valer[us Antoni]nus v.p. [p.p. Numi]diar[um]
IV.	308/11	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 7004 = 19419	Scironius Pasirates v.p. [p.p. Numi]diar[um]
V.	314	<i>CIL</i> , VIII, 18905	Val. Paulus v.p. p.p. N.

Pallu de Lessert² puts Valerius Florus (II) before Aurelius Quintianus (I). The persecution of the Christians at this time

¹ Pauly-Wiss., s.v. "Helena," VII, 2, 2821.

² *Fastes des prov. Afr.*, II, 311-14.

consisted of two periods, the *dies traditionis* and the *dies turificationis*, with an interval between them. Diocletian's first edict ordering the persecution was issued at Nicomedia, February 23, 303, and was put into effect in Numidia, May 19, 303. According to the inscription cited above (II), Florus was governor of Numidia during the *dies turificationis*, and Pallu de Lessert, believing that he was succeeded by Quintianus (I) before November 20, 303, is puzzled to find time for the two periods of persecution between May 19 and November 20. It seems to me that Costa¹ is undoubtedly right in placing these governors in the order in which I have put them above. He argues plausibly that the "edict of amnesty" which came between the two periods of persecution was issued at the time of the celebration of Diocletian's *vicennalia* (November 20, 303).² But whether this is true or not, Eusebius tells us that the emperor's edict ordering the second period of persecution, the *dies turificationis*, was received in Palestine in the second year of the persecution; i. e., in 304.³ That this is the right chronological order of the two governors is also clearly shown by the fact that Quintianus (I) is the last of a continuous line of governors of the simple *provincia Numidia*, while the governorship of Florus (II) marks the beginning of a series of governors of one or both of the two provinces into which Numidia was divided. Also, we have definite evidence that this division took place while Florus was governor.⁴ During the *dies turificationis* he superintended the persecution at Milev, which is very near Cirta, and in the part of the province which became Numidia Cirtensis. But in the other inscriptions he is called *p(raeses) N(umidia) M(ilitiana)*. The natural inference is that during the persecution he was governor of the undivided province (as was Quintianus, his immediate predecessor), and that, after the division, he became governor of Numidia Militiana. And since one of the inscriptions⁵ in which he holds this title also mentions Diocletian as emperor, the division was made

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 1833 f. The arguments I give below for this arrangement of the governors and for the division of Numidia in 304 are for the most part Costa's.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 1860.

³ *De Mart. Palaest.* 3. 1; cf. A. Maranesi, *L'Imp. Rom. e il Cristianesimo* (Torino, 1914), p. 450 f. Cf. also Costa's argument from St. August. *Contra Cresc.* III. 27 (*op. cit.*, p. 1861).

⁴ Cf. Costa, *op. cit.*, p. 1834.

⁵ *CIL*, VIII, 2345.

before his abdication.¹ We can therefore fix this division of Numidia definitely in 304 or very early in 305.

Valerius Antoninus (III) governed Numidia Cirtensis under both Diocletian and Constantine; he was probably its first governor. Later he seems to have governed both of the provinces, though they were still formally separate, as did also Pasirates (IV), whose governorship comes under the pretender Domitius Alexander.

The earliest governor of the reunited province whose date can definitely be fixed is Paulus (V), who held the province in 314. After that we find no further reference to a division of the province. The reunion of its two parts is doubtless to be connected with the rebuilding of Cirta, which was renamed Constantina,² after the overthrow of Alexander, which occurred in 311.

Since Numidia was not divided before 304, and the division did not last after 314, the *Laterculus Veronensis*, which lists the two provinces Numidia Cirtensis and Numidia Militiana, must have been drawn up between these two dates. I do not see how we can fix its date more closely. Of course the theory that it was drawn up about the time of Diocletian's retirement and represents his final arrangement of the provinces is a very plausible one, but we must remember that it is quite possible that the document dates from the time of Constantine and contains the names of provinces which were formed by him or some of his colleagues. As mentioned above, we have no proof whatever of the existence of the new Egyptian provinces or of Diospontus under Diocletian, and this statement applies to many other provinces. We can no longer accept the appearance of a province in the Veronese list as definite evidence that it existed in Diocletian's reign.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

¹ This is also proved by the inscriptions of Valerius Antoninus (III).

² Aurel. Victor *De Caes.* 40. 28.

DISSIMILATIVE WRITING IN REPUBLICAN LATIN AND VO IN PLAUTUS

By E. H. STURTEVANT

Several scholars¹ have in recent years shown quite conclusively that in certain important respects Latin orthography did not accurately represent the pronunciation, and they have traced a group of these irrational spellings to the influence of a precept of the schools. During the last century or two of the Republic there was a widespread prejudice against writing vv or ii, and consequently it was customary to spell qvov, ingenvos, servos, adicio, inferis² to indicate the pronunciations *quum*, *ingenuus*, *servus*, *adiicio*, *inferiis*.

Niedermann (p. 60) and Anderson (pp. 103 f.) feel that the aversion to vv was at least in part due to a desire to avoid ambiguity; but Kent justly remarks (p. 41) that servvs and the like are not ambiguous to one who speaks Latin. We may add that adicio and inferis are much more misleading than if written with ii. Then what was the origin of this bit of Roman pedantry? So pointless a theory could scarcely grow up except as an attempt to explain some previously existing anomaly, although when once adopted the theory may well have tended to perpetuate the anomaly. We may safely assume that the facts which we have before us—or some of them, at least—are older than the theory by which the Romans accounted for them. Lindsay, Niedermann, and Kent are quite right in thinking that pedantry was wholly responsible for the persistence in the last years of the Republic of such spellings as qvov for *cum*, servos for *servus*, adicio for *adiicio*, etc., but they must be wrong in supposing that the Romans chose so perverse a system of orthography for its own sake.

As far as origins are concerned, we are driven back upon the older explanation; the spellings with vo and with a single i were phonetic

¹ Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 227, 271; Niedermann, *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Saussure*, pp. 58–65; Mather, *Harvard Studies*, VI, 83–151; Anderson, *TAPA*, XL, 99–105; Kent, *TAPA*, XLIII, 35–56.

² In this paper small capitals are used to indicate spelling, while italics indicate that the pronunciation of quoted words is chiefly thought of.

to start with, although, as we have just seen, they continued in use after they had ceased to represent pronunciation. In some cases there is no doubt that a pronunciation once existed which would normally be represented by the spellings we have called anomalous. Thus compounds of *iacio* have an initial short syllable in the early dramatists (e.g., *ddiceret*, Plautus *Poen.* 1174), and consequently the spelling ADICIO was at that time phonetically correct. When *i* had been reintroduced from *ieci*, *iactus*, etc., the old spelling was retained for the new *adiicio*, and now the pedantic theory about *ii* was called in to explain the anomaly. Similarly POMPEI originally stood for *Pompēi* and *Pompēi* (both from *Pompēiū*), and when the analogy of *Pompēiū*, etc., restored *ii*, the shorter spelling was retained to represent *Pompēiū*. *Inferiis* regularly became *inferiis* about 150 B.C., and led to the spelling INFERIS, which was presently employed for the analogically restored *inferiis*. So, too, such spellings as SOCIETIS at first accurately represented the pronunciation, but when the phonetic distinction between *ei* and *i* broke down they required explanation, and so helped to suggest the rule that the letter *i* could not follow itself.

Kent understands ADIESE, ADIESET, and ADIESENT in the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus* as dissimilative writings for *adiisse*, etc. But this view is uncalled for if we accept Brugmann's identification¹ of Latin *ii* (perfect of *eo*) with Sanskrit *iy-āya*, *iy-ētha*, a perfect with "Attic" reduplication. Latin shows the diphthong, which should appear in the strong forms, in *red-iei*t (*CIL*, I, 541), *inter-ieisti* (*CIL*, I, 1202), *ad-iese* (i.e., *iē* from *iei*), and *sub-iūt*, etc., in the poets, while *īero* (Plautus *Capt.* 194), *īerant* (Terence *Ad.* 27), etc., and Umbrian *iust* preserve the *ī* (from *ī-ī-* of the weak forms) which appears in Sanskrit *īy-uṣ*, *īy-āth-uṣ*.

If Kent is right (p. 47) in interpreting ABIEGNIEIS, AESCVLNIEIS (*CIL*, I, 577) as *abiēgnēis*, *aesculnēis*, the pedantic aversion to double vowel signs must here have operated as an impelling cause, and it may indeed have done so at any time after it gained acceptance as an explanation of other phenomena. It is, however, still possible to interpret these words as *abiēgnīs* and *aesculnīs*, as I formerly did.²

¹ Grundriss², II (1913), No. 3, pp. 34 f.

² Contraction in the Case-Forms of the Latin "io-" and "ia-" Stems and of "deus," "is," and "idem," p. 35.

It is certain that the spellings QVOM, INGENVOS, and SERVOS once represented the pronunciation; but here there is a difficulty. If, as Anderson seems to think (p. 105), *servos* became *servus* at the time **dolos* became *dolus*, we have no explanation of the survival of the old spelling SERVOS beside the newer DOLVS; as we have already seen, the pedantic aversion to doubling a vowel sign cannot be the cause of the phenomena which that theory was invented to explain. It is, then, extremely probable that the pronunciation *servos* persisted after **dolos* had become *dolus*. This phonetic difference may have lasted only a short time; once a distinction in spelling has established itself it tends to persist after all reason for it has vanished—as witness a hundred anomalies in the traditional English orthography. It is possible, therefore, that SERVOS was pronounced *servus* even as early as Plautus' time; whether it actually was so pronounced or not is a question that will claim our attention later. At present we are merely contending that the pronunciation *servus* was of somewhat later origin than the pronunciation *dolus*.

The same reasoning goes to show that the change of *vollis* to *vultis* must have been somewhat later than the change of **mollus* to *multus*. That this actually was the history of the sounds we have fairly conclusive evidence. Anderson (pp. 102 f.) holds that no *ö* before *l* became *ũ* until after Plautus, but the evidence he cites scarcely justifies so wide a generalization. His argument is based upon the following: (1) CONSOLVERVNT, COSOLERETVR, TABOLAM, OQVOLTOD in the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus* of 186 B.C., (2) MOLTARE in *Eph. Ep.*, II, 298, and MOLTAI in *CIL*, XI, 4766, (3) CO(N)SOL in various early inscriptions, and (4) four passages in early authors where assonance makes the pronunciation *vol* for the later *vul* seem probable, e.g., Plautus *Amph.* 114, *volt voluptatem*. The evidence of the fourth group concerns the words *vollis*, *voll*, and *volta* (= *voltũs*), and it is therefore quite in harmony with the current opinion that the early Latin orthography *vo* was phonetic. Although evidence from puns and plays on words must be used with great caution, we may grant that Anderson has given us a valid reason for pronouncing early Latin *vol*+consonant as we have been accustomed to do.

His first three groups of evidence, however, can scarcely stand against the great host of words with *ul* from earlier *ol* which occur in our manuscripts of Plautus and Terence in the same form as in classical Latin. Such words are *multus*, *culpa*, *consultus*, *pulvis*, *fabula*, *stabulum*, *vestibulum*, *tetuli*, *postulo*, and others far too numerous to name. It is granted that one form on a stone is more valuable than many forms in manuscripts, since the orthography of the dramatists may have been largely modernized; but it is after all scarcely credible that so far-reaching an alteration as this should have been made in Plautus' spelling without leaving some traces of the original state of affairs.

We must, therefore, inquire whether Anderson's epigraphic instances of *ol* may not be archaistic spellings of *ul*. In the first place, it is well known that the legal phraseology of the Romans was in general very conservative, and furthermore that the laws of the Twelve Tables were so thoroughly learned by every schoolboy that they had a powerful influence upon the development of the Latin language. We cannot, then, lay much stress upon the archaic spelling of a legal word like *molto* or *molta*, or of a publicist's word like *co(n)sol*. There remain the four forms in the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*, a document which is known to contain archaisms (e.g., the ablative *-d*). Some of the forms themselves are rather suspicious: the phonetic interpretation of *oqvoltod* is too uncertain to serve as the basis of an argument; the verb *consulo* was popularly connected with *consul* (Varro *LL*. 5. 80: "consul nominatus qui consuleret populum et senatum, nisi illinc potius unde Accius ait in Bruto 'qui recte consulat, consul ciat'"), and therefore *ol* in *CONSOLVERVNT* and *COSOLERETVR* may be due to the traditional spelling *co(n)sol* (note the omission of *n* in the second word).

As far as *ol*+consonant is concerned, we have in Plautus' *sultis* for *si voltis* indubitable proof that the change to *ul* (except after *v*) was earlier than that author's day. Since *v* is lost only between like vowels, *sultis* must be due to the analogical proportion, *vis:sis=voltis:z*,¹ which could yield nothing but **soltis*. This **soltis* changed before Plautus' time to *sultis*, which occurs with this spelling in the

¹ Cf. Lindsay, *The Captivi of Plautus*, p. 230.

Ambrosian manuscript in *Stich.* 65, and many times in the other manuscripts, and whose *u* is guaranteed by such *vv. ll.* as *stultis* (BCD) in *Rudens* 820. In this word a modernizing of Plautus' spelling is out of the question, since *sultis* is not quotable from any later author. The contrast in pronunciation between *voltis* and *multus*, which we found ourselves bound on theoretic grounds to assume for some early period, is shown by *sultis* to have belonged to the period of Plautus. That *voltis* was still pronounced with an *o* in Caecilius' time is Anderson's inference from *Aethrio* 5 (cited by Diomed. 1. 386 K.): "Actutum, *voltis*, empta est; *noltis*, non empta est."

Anderson argues that before Plautus' time *uo* and *vo* became *uu* and *vu* in all circumstances under which Imperial Latin shows the change, excepting only in the position before *l*. Although Kent (p. 41) accepts the conclusion, the present writer is still unconvinced. The first argument is this: "It seems certain . . . , in view . . . of the fact that vowel weakening normally came later in accented than in unaccented syllables, that *servos* began to be pronounced *servus* at a considerable interval before *volnus* began to be pronounced *vulnus*." We may admit the validity of the reasoning, merely substituting the word "likely" for the word "certain," but as long as we do not know when *volnus* became *vulnus* such a consideration can scarcely be said to "establish" *servus* in the plays of Plautus. The only other evidence adduced that applies to words of the type of *servos* is the spelling *FLAVS* in *CIL*, I, 277 (an early coin inscription), which Anderson interprets as *Flavus*.² It seems more likely that it is a phonetic spelling of the form which regularly developed from *Flavos*.³ *Flaus* then stands in the same relation to *Flavus* as *deus* to *divus*, *oleum* to *olivum*, and *Gnaeus* to *naevus*.

The words with *quo > cu* form a special class, since they exhibit two changes which may or may not have taken place at the same time. The confusion between the preposition *cum* and the conjunc-

¹ Kent, *loc. cit.*

² Anderson's citation of Ritschl's theory (*Opusc.*, IV, 488) about this form is incorrect, but, as Ritschl's discussion of the matter is now antiquated, we need not consider it here.

³ See Solmsen, *Studien zur lateinischen Lautgeschichte*, pp. 37 f.; cf. Sommer, *Handbuch*, p. 162.

tion, which is proved by the use of *qvom*¹ for the preposition in *CIL*, I, 34 (about 150 B.C.), shows that the conjunction had come to be pronounced *cum* shortly after Terence's death. Although it is possible that the influence of *tum* made *quom* become *cum* before *equom* became *ecum*, it is probably safer in the absence of further evidence to assume that all words with unaccented *quo* suffered the change at about this time. Anderson's argument that since *u* after *q* was a weak sound it could not have prevented *equos* from becoming *equus* at the time **dolos* became *dolus* is not convincing. There seems to be no cogent reason for doubting the phonetic character of the Plautine and Terentian spellings *qvom*, *eqvos*, etc.

The conclusions which Kent draws from his own paper and those of Mather and Anderson (Kent, pp. 55 f.) require one modification. The use of *i* for *ii* and *iii* and the use of *vo* for *uu* and *vu* was due in each case to the retention of an old orthography to denote a changed pronunciation. The resulting anomalies were explained in the schools as due to the impropriety of doubling vowel signs,² and the satisfaction given by this explanation perpetuated for varying lengths of time some of the unphonetic spellings.

Anderson's conclusions need revision in two points. His attack upon the traditional interpretation of *vo* in Plautus is not successful, and he is wrong in dating after Plautus the weakening of *ol* (except when *v* precedes) to *ul*. On the other hand, he supplies a useful prop for the current theory in regard to the pronunciation of *voltis*, etc., in Plautus. He shows that the change of unaccented *quo* to *cu* took place about 150 B.C., a hundred years earlier than had been supposed, and he makes it probable that the spelling *vo* for imperial *vv* was no longer phonetic in Cicero's time.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

¹ A less satisfactory explanation of this form is suggested by Sommer, *Handbuch*³, p. 158.

² Was this explanation due to the same grammarians who rejected Accius' plan for denoting vowel length by doubling?

SOME LATIN ETYMOLOGIES

BY FRANCIS A. WOOD

1. *Hebeo* 'be blunt or dull; be sluggish, inactive; lounge, idle about,' *hebes* 'blunt, dull; dim, faint; sluggish, stupid' may be referred to a root **ghebh-* 'yield, give way' and compared with *give*: OE. *giesan* 'give, grant,' Goth. *giban* 'geben,' etc. This primary meaning survives in NE. *give, give up, give in, give out, give way*, Goth. *afgiban sik* 'sich wegbegeben, χωρισθῆναι,' OHG. *geban* 'dare, tribuere, reddere, indulgere,' *gigeban* 'dare, largiri, concedere, expendere, removere,' *bigeban* 'linquere, derelinquere, dimittere,' *zigeban* 'dehiscere, patere,' MHG. *begeben* 'auf-, hingeben, von etwas ablassen, unterlassen.'

2. *Helluor, hēluor* 'gormandize, devour; squander, lavish' probably meant primarily 'gulp.' We may therefore compare Gr. *χεύσσω, -ύσσομαι* 'cough up, expectorate,' and the following words in Germ.: early Du. *gullen* 'absorbere, ingurgitare, vorare, intemperanter devorare,' *gulle* 'vorago, gurgus,' NE. *gull* 'swallow, gulp': ME. *gulchen*, NE. dial. *gulch, gullock* 'swallow greedily, gulp,' Norw. dial. *gulka*, Swed. dial. *gylka, gölka* 'gulp up, spew out'; ME. *gulpen*, NE. *gulp* 'swallow greedily,' dial. *gollop* 'gulp,' Dan. *gulpe, gylpe* 'gulp up, disgorge,' Du. *gulpen* 'swallow greedily; gulp up,' *gulp, golp, galp* 'a gulp; a sudden gush,' EFris. *gulpen* 'ausstossen, rülpsen; gierig hineinschlucken.' Cf. author, *Hesperia, Ergänzungsreihe* I, 12, 62.

3. *Honōs, honor* 'honor, esteem; official dignity, office; reward, fee, sacrifice, legacy; ornament, grace, charm' is unexplained. If the connection I shall suggest is correct, the primary meaning would be 'a prosperous, flourishing condition, prosperity (:honor, preferment, etc.); bloom (:beauty, charm).' For *honōs* may be from an earlier **χ^uonōs* (**g^uhonōs*), with loss of the labialization before *o*, parallel with the development of IE. *g^uo-* to Lat. *co-*. Against deriving *honōs* from **g^uhonōs* might be cited *formus*: Skt. *gharmā-h* 'Glut, Hitze.' But *formus* may be rather from **χ^uermos*: Gr. *θερμός* 'warm.'

Compare Skt. *ā-handh* 'schwellend, strotzend, üppig,' *ghandh* 'kompakt, dick, dicht,' Gr. *εὐθενής εὐθηνής* 'in good case, flourishing,' *εὐθενέω* 'be lucky, prosper, flourish,' *εὐθηνεία* 'a flourishing state, health, plenty, wealth,' etc.

4. *Infans* 'child, young of animals,' is supposed to be identical with *infans* 'speechless, dumb' from *in-* 'un-' and *fārī* 'speak.' Though confused, the two words are better separated, Varro and his followers to the contrary notwithstanding.

Infans 'infant, child, young of animal,' *adj.* 'young, new, fresh,' of inanimate things, *infantia* 'infancy,' *infantis* 'belonging to infants; young, little,' etc. may be derived from **en* 'in' and **bhuānt-*, root *bheṃā-* 'grow, become, be,' with ablaut as in *-bam*, *-bās*, etc. Hence the primary meaning of *infans* was 'growing within, ingrowth; *ἐμφυσις*,' and then 'a new-born child, a young animal.' For meaning compare Gr. *βρώ* 'swell,' *ἐμβρυον* 'embryo; lambkin, kid.'

5. *Lūdus* 'play, sport, jest, trick,' *lūdo* 'play, sport, frolic; ridicule, banter; delude, deceive' may represent both **loid-* and **leud-*. For the former cf. Walde², 444 with references. For the latter compare ChSl. *ludŭ* 'μωπός, töricht,' Russ. *ludil* 'betrügen, täuschen,' Bulg. *luděŭ* 'Narretei treiben,' Czech *louditi* 'locken, betrügen,' *ludar* 'Gaukler,' Goth. *liuts* 'heuchlerisch,' pl. 'Gaukler,' etc. (cf. Berneker, *Slav. Et. Wb.* 743).

6. *Luscus*, *luscinus*, *lusciosus* 'that can see in the dusk, but not by lamp-light, dim-sighted, purblind,' *luscitio* 'vitium oculorum, quod clarius vesperi quam meridie cernit' may have *lusc-* from **lut-sk-*: Russ. *luda* 'Trübung der Hornhaut' (cornea), dial. *ludd* 'blendender Glanz,' *ludŭl* 'durch Glanz blenden, spiegeln,' LRuss. *ludd* 'Schuppe auf dem Auge; Blendwerk, Trugbild,' Czech *ob-luda* 'Gespenst, Phantom,' Pol. *tudzić* 'täuschen, trügen; blenden, locken,' OE. *lūtian* 'lie hid, lurk, skulk,' OHG. *lūzēn* 'verborgen liegen, heimlich lauern,' MHG. *lūzen* id., 'heimlich hervorschauen,' *loschen*, OHG. *loskēn* 'verborgen liegen,' with *lusk-* from **lut-sk-* as in Lat. *luscus*. Cf. No. 5.

The forms *nuscitiōsus*, *nuscitiōnes* have *n* from *nox*, as if meaning 'seeing by night.'

Compare the same development in meaning in Germ. *lūr-*: MHG. *lūren* 'lauern,' *lūre* 'schlauer, hinterlistiger Mensch,' *lūr(e)*

'Lauer, Hinterhalt,' NHG. *lauern*, Als. *luren* 'heimlich aufpassen; faulenzeln; halb schlafen, halb wachen,' Icel. *lúra*, 'doze, nap,' ME. *lūren* 'lurk,' NE. *lower* 'look sullen, watch in sullen silence; appear dark and gloomy,' early Du. *loeren* 'mit den Augen blinzeln, auflauern.'

7. *Paträre* 'bring to pass, perform' may be for **parträre* 'bring through, further,' with loss of the first *r* by dissimilation, from **př-t(e)rā-, -tero-* 'further.' Compare OE. *furþor* 'further,' OHG. *furdar*, *furdir*, etc., whence OHG. *fordārōn* 'fordern,' NHG. *fordern* and, with loss of *r* as in Latin, *fodern*, OHG. *furdiren* 'fördern, vorwärts bringen,' OE. *fyrþran* 'advance, further, promote,' etc. Compare also OE. *forþ* 'forth, forward,' *forþian* 'promote; accomplish, patrare.' For the long syllabic *r* compare Skt. *pūrva-ḥ* 'former,' Lith. *pīrmas* 'first.'

In this connection it may be noted that *exträre* (: *exterus*, *extrā*), *inträre* (: *interus*, *intrā*) do not justify us in assuming a **träre*. The verbs are formed as indicated above. Compare OE. *innian* 'enter; lodge,' *ge-innian* 'admit; entertain': *inn* 'house, chamber,' *inn*, *inne* 'within'; MHG. *innern* 'erinnern': *inner* 'inner'; OE. *ȳtan* 'expel,' MLG. *ūten* *herausgeben*; *äussern*: *ūt* 'aus'; *ūteren* 'hin-austreiben; ausgeben; äussern,' NHG. *äussern*, NE. *utter*: OS. *ūtar* 'ausser,' etc.

8. *Vadum* 'a ford,' *vadäre* 'ford, wade,' *vādere* 'advance, go,' *invādere* 'go, come, or get into; enter upon; rush upon, assault, attack, invade; fall upon, seize,' OHG. *wat* 'vadum,' *watan* 'waten, schreiten, gehen, dringen; *tr.* durchwaten, durchdringen,' etc. are from a root **uadh-* of the *a*-series with dehnstufe *ā*, *ō*. The primary meaning was probably 'push (forward), thrust, pierce,' and hence like the root **per-*, gives 'ford' and 'push through, penetrate.' I therefore compare Gr. *ώθew* 'thrust, push, shove,' Skt. *vadh-* 'schlagen, töten.' With Gr. *ώθειν ξίφος διά τινος* 'thrust a sword through one' compare MHG. *ir pfîle kunnen waten durch daz fleisch; der slac, daz sper im durch daz hirn wuot*, MLG. *waden* 'schreiten, waten,' with *dor* 'durchdringen, durchbohren,' MDu. *waden* 'wade; pierce, of a weapon in the body,' *wade* 'a ford; a break in a dike,' OE. *wadan* 'advance, go,' *gewadan* 'penetrate,' etc. In all these the primary meaning 'push, thrust' is still apparent.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE INSCRIPTIONS OF HALAE, *AJA*, 1915, 438 ff.

In the course of the excavations conducted by Miss Goldman and Miss Walker at the site of Halae in Locris, a few inscriptions came to light, and, with the exception of the grave stelae, these are now published by Miss Goldman in the current number of the *American Journal of Archaeology* (Second Series, XIX [1915], 438 ff.). The publication is wholly creditable, and in matters of reading and interpretation there is little occasion for added comment. The purpose of this note is to call attention to some points of linguistic interest, for the material from eastern Locris is so limited that any addition to it is scanned with more than usual curiosity.

No. 1 is a sixth-century dedication, in two hexameter verses:

Εὐφρανδρος μ' ἀνέθηκε [κόρ]ον περικα(λ)λέει πο[ιῶ]ν
[χ]ήρσι φιλαῖσιν ἔδο[κεν] τάθ[α]ναι [πολ]ύχοι[οι].

The dialect is epic (note the form and use of φιλαῖσιν and the ν movable, necessary for the meter, in ἔδο[κεν]), with nothing distinctively local. Εὐφρανδρος is to be added to the examples of the ϝ representing the glide between ν and a following vowel, as Boeot. Βακείρμαι, Cyp. κατεσκεύασε, Lac. Εὐβάλης. The restoration πο[ιῶ]ν, which fits precisely the requirements of space and of sense, Miss Goldman hesitates to adopt, because one would expect ποιήσας. But the use of the present participle referring to action prior to that of the leading verb is paralleled in Homer (e.g., *Od.* i. 126, 130) and elsewhere. Cf. Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, I, § 337; Stahl, *Syntax des griech. Verbums*, p. 209. So long as the participles, except the future, remained independent of pure time relations, there is nothing abnormal in this, and for such a use of ποιῶν in particular it is pertinent to compare the appearance of ἐποίει beside ἐποίησε in dedications, in about the proportion of one to three (Loewy, p. xiii).

No. 2 is a fifth-century dedication: Θεαγένεος κ' Ἀριστομένεος καὶ Φσανῶ ἀρχόντων Χαλεῖς ἀνέθεν τάθ[α]ναι. Σφόπα ἔστασε. It is of interest to find, at this early date, the Boeotian ἀνέθεν, and Σφόπα belongs to that type of masculine nominatives in -ᾱ which, though found elsewhere in Northwest Greek, is by far most common in Boeotian. Ψανός is an addition to Bechtel's collection of *Personennamen aus Spitznamen*.

No. 3 is a third-century inscription of twenty-one lines, containing a list of officials, and dated by the archon of the Boeotian League. It is not in Boeotian, but Boeotian influence is apparent in the ι of πολεμαρχιόντων, χοραγιόντων, Καλλιφάνιος (but Ἐπικράτεος, Μενεκράτεος, Κλεομένης), in the

dative τοῖ κοινοῖ, and in γραμματίζοντας. For this last is the Boeotian γραμματίδω = Att. γραμματεῖω, with elimination of the Boeotian phonetic peculiarity, just as in some κοινή inscriptions of Boeotia. Of the personal names, Ὀφέλανδρος is known in Boeotian (also Corinthian), and Χαρίνοστος reminds us that Εὐνοστος, the only other name in -νοστος, is especially common in Boeotia. Ἐπάρμοστος is a good Locrian name; cf. Διδύμων Ἐπαρμόστω Ὀπούντιος, *IG*, IX, 1, 393, and Pindar's ode to Ἐφάρμοστος of Opus. Φυνόλων is new, and an unusual type of hypocoristic from names in -λαος. Cf. Ἐρμολλος, Κρίνολλος, and Boeot. Τιμόλλει, Τιμολλώ. Μνασῆν was already known as one of the many such names in -ῆν on the coins of Apollonia and Durrhachium (*SGDI*, 3225), but its occurrence here in Locris adds to the rare examples of the type in this part of Greece (cf. Solmsen, *Beiträge zur griech. Wortforschung*, 116 ff.), namely Delph. Χερσῆν (*SGDI*, 2504), Boeot. Τελλῆν in an inscription of Delphi (*BCH*, XXVII, 51), and Boeot. Ἀκ[ρη]φείν = Ἀκραίφην (fragment of Corinna, *Berl. Klassikertexte*, V, 30). Observe Κλέμαχος, like Meg. Θέδωρος, etc., beside Κλεομένης, and Κλενόμαχος in No. 4. This last is paralleled only by Arg. Κλεάνδρα (*BCH*, XXXII, 236), and both probably owe the -εν to the hypocoristic Κλεῖας which is attested for Thesalian (a new Thesalian example of this type is Κρατεῖας, *IG*, IX, 2, 508, 55, Ἀρχ. Ἐφ., 1915, p. 9).

Of the official titles the most interesting is πεταμνφάνταιραι, "evidently women acting in an official capacity, as πετάσματος ὑφάνταιραι, weavers of the spreading cloth," that is "the garment woven for the Athena of Halae," as Miss Goldman justly explains it. This implies a πέτα-μνο-ν formed from πετα- in the manner of τέρα-μνο-ν, βελε-μνο-ν, κρήδε-μνο-ν. The πεντάμεροι are officials appointed for five days, such as were implied by the Delph. πενταμαριτεῦων of the Labyadae inscription. Others, not new, are the λανπάδαρχοι, the ἀπόλογοι, known at Thasos and Agrigentum (cf. Miss Goldman's citations, p. 449), and the ἱεροί, known as officials in the Andania inscription. For the forms which Miss Goldman transcribes τοῦροί, τάπολόγοι, and understands as datives with participle omitted (comparing ἄρχοντες τῷ ἱερῷ from Orchomenos), are surely titles in the nominative, like the others, standing for τοῖ ἱεροί and τοῖ ἀπόλογοι. The form τοαροι is surprising in any case, for one would expect τιαροι (cf. Elean τιαροί = τοῖ ἱαροί), or, if the spiritus asper was still pronounced, θιαροι (cf. Att. θυῶι = τῷ νίῳ). Without resorting to the assumption of an error of the stonecutter, I can see only one possible explanation. At the time when τοι before an initial vowel, e.g., in τοῖ ἀπόλογοι, lost its now intervocalic ι, and subsequently the ο by elision, it remained unchanged before the spiritus asper of ἱαροί (strictly ἱαροί at that period). After the spiritus asper ceased to be pronounced, τοῖ ἱεροί was blended into τοιεροί, which then lost the ι, but stopped short of elision of the ο. Such a loss of intervocalic ι without any resulting change of the preceding vowel is of course common enough in the interior of a word (ποῖω, etc.), but almost unknown in sentence combination (cf. καὶ ἐν, *IG*, II, 50, cited

by Blass, *Aussprache*, 54). On the other hand, no difficulty is involved in the history of the spiritus asper assumed here. It existed in the Locrian of the fifth century (cf. Χαλεῖς in No. 2), but was already on the verge of disappearance, if we may judge from the irregularities of its representation in the West Locrian inscriptions (cf. my *Greek Dialects*, § 58, d). Its loss in later Locrian is indicated, not necessarily by πεντάμοροι (*ibid.*, § 58, b), but by Ἐπάρμοστος.

CARL D. BUCK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

EMENDATION OF PLATO *Laws* 795 B

διαφέρει δὲ πάμπλου μαθὼν μὴ μαθόντος καὶ ὁ γυμνασάμενος τοῦ μὴ γεγυμνασμένου. καθάπερ γὰρ ὁ τελείως παγκράτιον ἡσκηκὼς ἢ πυγμαῖον ἢ πάλην οὐκ ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν ἀριστερῶν ἀδύνατός ἐστι μάχεσθαι, χωλαίνει δὲ καὶ ἐφέλκεται πλημμελῶν, ὅπταν αὐτὸν τις μεταβιβάζων ἐπὶ θάτερα ἀναγκάζῃ διαπονεῖν, ταῦτόν δὲ τοῦτ', οἶμαι, καὶ ἐν ὅπλοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι χρή προσδοκᾶν ὀρθόν.

For ἀδύνατος here I would read δυνατός.

Plato is arguing for ambidexterity. He says that just as a good pancratiast or boxer can use his skill equally well on the left or the right, so it should be with a man trained to fight in arms, etc. This idea is put in the familiar Greek form of the *argumentum ex contrario* and the clew to the construction is the fact that the οὐκ, as normally in this idiom, negates the two following conjoint clauses and its force is thus carried on to χωλαίνει and ἐφέλκεται. Just as it is not true that a good boxer or wrestler can fight ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν, but limps and drags if you compel him to turn the other way, so the same ability to fight either way is the right thing to expect of a man at arms. This imperatively requires δυνατός, as will perhaps appear more clearly from a comparison with 634 A, not, I believe, hitherto cited in this connection.

Ὁ Διὸς οὖν δὴ καὶ ὁ Πυθικὸς νομοθέτης οὐ δήπου χολὴν τὴν ἀνδρείαν νενομοθετήκατον, πρὸς τὰριστερὰ μόνον δυναμένην ἀντιβαίνειν, πρὸς τὰ δεξιὰ καὶ κομπᾶ καὶ θωπευτικὰ ἀδυνατοῦσαν; ἢ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρα;

Here too it will be observed that the ability to act in both directions, πρὸς ἀμφοτέρα, is affirmed by negating the conjunction of ability to work in one direction with inability to work in another.

The affirmative δυναμένην comes in the first clause and the negative ἀδυνατοῦσαν follows in the second.¹

What has misled the interpreters in 795 B is the fact that for the simple negation in the second clause Plato substitutes the periphrastic description, χωλαίνει δὲ καὶ ἐφέλκεται πλημμελῶν, which, however, is obviously equivalent to a negative.

¹ I of course do not mean to imply the identity of the two passages, for 634 A is mainly figurative, δεξιὰ is used in a special sense, and the preposition is πρὸς.

The reading *ἀδύνατος* can hardly be construed. Ritter and Richards ignore the difficulty. Stallbaum gives no aid. Ast seems to understand the force of *οὐκ*, but does not draw the necessary inference as to the text, and he is only half right about *δέ*. He says: "Negatio οὐκ, orationi prae fixa, etiam ad *χωλαίνει δὲ καὶ ἐφέλκεται* pertinent; *δέ* enim post *χωλαίνει* non particulae οὐκ oppositum est, sed verbis ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν ἀριστερῶν, quibus respondent ἐπὶ θάτερα."

Müller translates impossibly, apparently misunderstanding *πλημμελῶν* (p. 214): "Denn sowie, wer den Gesamtkampf vollständig eingeübt hat, oder den Faustkampf und das Ringen, nicht unvermögend ist, von der linken Seite aus den Kampf zu bestehen, vernachlässigte er Das aber, erlahmt und nachhinkt, wenn Jemand die Richtung ändert und ihn seine Kraft nach der andern Seite zu wenden nöthigt: ebenso lässt sich Dasselbe auch mit Recht in Waffenkämpfe und allem Andern erwarten."

The Didot Latin version reads somewhat obscurely: "nam sicut is, qui in pugilatu vel in luctatione vel in utroque perfecte se exercuit, non ad pugnam a sinistra ineptus claudicat insciteque membra trahit, si quis eum in alteram partem transferre laborem cogat; eodem modo," etc.

Jowett, perhaps intending to reproduce the Didot Latin, renders: "For as he who is perfectly skilled in the pancratium or boxing or wrestling is not unable to fight from his left side, and does not limp and draggle in confusion when his opponent makes him change his position, so," etc.

This is a barely possible, though obscure, English expression of the main idea, but it is hardly a possible translation of the Greek. Surely the *δέ* must oppose *χωλαίνει*, etc., to its opposite, and the words *χωλαίνει δὲ καὶ ἐφέλκεται* . . . ὁπόταν αὐτόν τις μεταβιβάζων ἐπὶ θάτερα ἀναγκάζῃ διαπονεῖν to a Greek ear imply an antithesis with the ability to fight ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν, and this necessitates the reading *δυνατός*. To justify Jowett's or a similar rendering, we must (1) take *δέ* as "and." Is this likely in a *δέ καὶ* clause following a *μὲν* clause preceded by a negative applying to both clauses? The examples of the negative carried on to *καὶ* in Kühner-Gerth, sec. 513, 2 An. 1, are not relevant. (2) We must take *ἐπὶ θάτερα* as the wrong side virtually repeating ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν. Such an extension of the idiomatic use of *ἕτερος* in the *δαίμων ἕτερος* is of course possible. But I cannot find a case of *ἕτερος* so used to repeat an unfavorable synonym or an extension of this meaning to the prepositional phrase *ἐπὶ θάτερα*. And surely when one direction is specified or implied, *ἐπὶ θάτερα* would naturally suggest the opposite. Cf. *Laws* 771C. In *Laws* 758A τῇ ἐτέρῃ (not ἐπὶ θάτερα) does in fact imply the worse of two. But it is defined by τῇ τῆς τύχης δεομένη and there is a distinct antithesis.

The argument *ex contrario* is well known from the collections of Gebauer, but a parallel or two may be cited here:

Demosth. 29. 54: οὐ τοίνυν ἐγὼ μὲν ταῦθ' ἔτοιμος ἦν, οἱ δὲ μάρτυρες οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἐμοὶ εἶχον.

Hyp. *Pro Eux.* xxxviii: καὶ οὐ σὲ μὲν οὕτως οἶομαι δεῖν πράττειν, αὐτὸς, δὲ ἄλλον τινὰ τρόπον τῇ πολιτείᾳ κέχρημαι.

Aristid. ii, p. 685 Df.: καὶ οὐχὶ πάλαι μὲν οὕτω πρὸς πάντας θαυμαστῶς ἴσχεν ἡ πόλις, νῦν δὲ ὡς ἐτέρως.

The application of the construction here seems quite independent of any question as to the technical force of ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν in Greek boxing or wrestling. It is enough for our purpose that it is opposed to ἐπὶ θάτερα. For the rest, the relativity of the phrase may be illustrated from the observation of Herodotus ii. 36: γράμματα γράφουσι καὶ λογίζονται ψήφοις Ἕλληνες μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ φέροντες τὴν χεῖρα, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν δεξιῶν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀριστερά. καὶ ποιούντες ταῦτα αὐτοὶ μὲν φασὶ ἐπὶ δεξιὰ ποιεῖν, Ἕλληνας δὲ ἐπ' ἀριστερά. Still if ἀπὸ τῶν ἀριστερῶν designates the abnormal and harder way, it would in strict logic make against my interpretation. But Plato need not have been thinking of this any more than Hector was in the boast (*Il.* vii. 238):

οἷδ' ἐπὶ δεξιὰ οἷδ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ νομῆσαι βῶν.

The only escape I can see from the emendation is to assume that Plato himself by inadvertence wrote ἀδύνατος. Such momentary mental confusion is of course always conceivable. The sentence, "No event is too extraordinary to be impossible," stands today in the printed text of Huxley's writings. But Huxley would doubtless have welcomed an emendation. And if by an oversight Plato wrote ἀδύνατος, it is, I think, probable that he meant δυνατός.¹

PAUL SHOREY

THE DATE OF CICERO *Ad Att.* xv. 6

Cicero's Letter *Ad Att.* xv. 6, is dated on May 28 or 29, 44 B.C., by all recent editions, apparently because of its position in the manuscript in a series of letters that fall between May 24 and June 2. Position in the manuscript is, however, no criterion, for when Atticus was traveling about—as at this time he was moving about between Rome, Lanuvium, and Tusculum—he did not always receive his letters in their due order, and in such cases he frequently placed them in his roll in wrong sequence. A brief examination will show that the letter should be dated about June 2, and that in consequence two passages that have been misunderstood because of the erroneous dating will at once become clear.

¹ Logical confusions between affirmative and negative, positive and privative are common in idiom, colloquial speech, and literature. Campbell (essay on the text, *Republic*, Vol. II, p. 106) says that there are more than fifty instances of this form of error in the MSS of the *Republic*. In Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* III, 2, 205 the text reads, "Let all constant men be called Troiluses," where strict logic requires "inconstant."

First as to date: the letter contains a letter from Hirtius to Cicero written upon his leaving Rome, in which he says: "Noli autem me tam strenuum putare ut *ad Nonas* recurram." Now it will be remembered that Antony on June 1 or 2 amazed Rome by passing a plebiscite which conferred upon himself the Gallic provinces for five years, and about the same time he announced a senate meeting for the Nones at which Brutus and Cassius were to be "kicked upstairs" by means of a grain commission (see Sternkopf, *Hermes*, 1912). Now Cicero, who was at Tusculum, received the news of this announced meeting directly from Balbus on the evening of June 2 (*Att.* xv. 9. 1). The announcement could hardly have been made before the evening of June 1 or the morning of June 2. This, then, is the meeting to which Hirtius (in *Att.* xv. 6) says he has no intention of going, and his letter is doubtless to be dated on or very soon after June 2. Because of the importance of the matter contained in it Cicero probably sent it to Atticus at once, which gives us June 2-3 as the date of *Att.* xv. 6.

Because of the misdating of this letter the editors have concluded from xv. 6. 2: "Etiam ex urbe sum profectus. Utilius enim statui abesse," that Hirtius was not at Rome on the eventful June 1, though it is now clear that he was. They have accordingly changed the text of *Att.* xv. 5. 2: "Et Hirtius quidem se *acturum*," to *afuturum*, and misinterpreted the phrases that follow. Since Hirtius did go to Rome¹ for the senate meeting of June 1, it is entirely natural that he should, two or three days before, say that he intended to further (*acturum*) the interests of peace by supporting a conciliatory measure² by which the liberators should be assigned provinces at once. No one then knew that the commission which Antony had in mind was to be in the form of an insult. *Acturum* found in M. should therefore be rehabilitated. The phrases that follow the passage prove, therefore, to refer, not to Hirtius' fear of danger to himself, but merely to Hirtius' fear of danger to Cicero: *ille quidem* and *ego autem* both refer back to the causes (*auctor*) why Cicero should remain away from Rome.

Finally, to come back to Hirtius' letter (*Att.* xv. 6. 2), the editors by placing the letter before the plebiscite of June 1-2 have failed to see the point of the words: "Nihil enim iam video opus esse nostra cura, *quoniam praesidia sunt in tot annos provisae*." Tyrrell and Purser give the usual view: "[This] seems to refer to all the measures, military and otherwise, by which Caesar had sought to ensure the stability of the State." However, it is strange that measures taken by Caesar before his death on the Ides of March should now

¹ If further proof of his presence at Rome were necessary, *Att.* xv. 8, written on the day before the Calends, says: "After your departure I had a letter . . . from Hirtius who writes that he is very much out of favor with the veterans." Hirtius was certainly then at Rome and not with Cicero at Tusculum as he had been when xv. 5 was written.

² This was also Hirtius' rôle early in April, as appears from *Ad. fam.* xi. 1, that extremely important letter which Professor Merrill has now convincingly dated (*Class. Phil.*, 1915, pp. 241 ff.).

suddenly induce Hirtius to hurry away from Rome where he had just arrived a day or two before. The reference is clearly a sarcastic reference by the consul-elect to the surprising plebiscite of June 1-2, whereby Antony gained command of Gaul for five years, a plebiscite which at once revealed Antony's plan to become master of Rome as Caesar had been and which might soon place Hirtius in the painful predicament of choosing between his promised consulship and a position as supporter of his old-time friend Antony.

The conclusion of this note is that Hirtius was at Rome on June 1, that *acturum* should be restored to the text of *Att.* xv. 5. 2, that Hirtius' letter (*Att.* xv. 6. 2-3) should be dated about June 2, and that the phrase *praesidia sunt in tot annos provisa* in his letter may safely be added to Sternkopf's arguments (*Hermes*, 1912, p. 340) to prove that Antony had the *lex de permutatione provinciarum* passed on June 1-2.

TENNEY FRANK

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

BOOK REVIEWS

The Scholia on the "Aves" of Aristophanes. With an Introduction on the Origin, Development, Transmission, and Extant Sources of the Old Greek Commentary on His Comedies. By JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE. Boston and London: Ginn & Co., 1914. Pp. cxii+378.

All Hellenists and lovers of Aristophanes in particular are under obligation to Professor White for his valuable studies of the manuscripts and meters of the comic poet. Soon after writing the preface to the *Facsimile of the Codex Venetus Marcianus 474 of Aristophanes* he began this edition of the scholia on the *Birds*. It was completed and put in type ten years ago, but publication was delayed until the Introduction could be prepared. Meanwhile his attention was drawn away to the subject of Greek meter, as his numerous magazine articles, and especially his recent book *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, testify. Now at length he has found time to resume his studies of the old Greek commentary on Aristophanes.

The Introduction contains an admirably clear account of the sources of this commentary. Its provenience is Alexandria, the literary center of Hellenism from the third century on, famous alike for the rich treasures of literature in its great library of half a million papyrus rolls, and for its museum in which were gathered together the most celebrated scholars from all parts of Greece. These men wrote treatises and commentaries on the old Greek authors and among others on Aristophanes, for the comic poet dealt so largely with local affairs that many of his allusions had by this time become obscure and required elucidation. Foremost of the commentators on Aristophanes in Alexandria were Callimachus, Eratosthenes, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Callistratus, and Aristarchus, and these, says Professor White, must be regarded as the main source of the commentary on Aristophanes. Their commentaries were collected shortly before the time of Christ by Didymus, a compiler rather than an original genius, and arranged by him in what may be called the first variorum edition. About a century later Symmachus, perhaps a specialist on comedy, produced a second variorum edition, drawing his material chiefly from Didymus, but using other sources of information as well. These commentaries were large separate works; they were not written on the margin of the text in the way that is familiar to us. But in the fourth or fifth century, according to Professor White, some scholar, probably in Constantinople, the new center of Hellenism, transferred to the

same parchment codex both the text of the poet and the commentary "of Symmachus and others," in order to preserve them against the possibility of loss, and this codex with its marginal scholia is the archetype of the extant manuscripts of Aristophanes.

"The Venetus furnishes the fullest and most trustworthy text now extant of the learned comment of the Alexandrine scholars on Aristophanes. In contrast with this, the scholia in the Ravennas may justly be characterized as meager, incomplete, and often incoherent." Consequently in this edition of the scholia on the *Birds* Professor White has placed a literal transcript of the Venetus scholia on the right-hand pages of his book facing his restored text of the scholia which appears on the left-hand pages. The transcript includes also any additional scholia in RFE that are not found in V. Below the transcript is a collation of all the important manuscripts, and on the opposite page below the editor's text are the critical notes. The collation gives all variants from the text of the transcript in GRTEM and the *editio princeps*, the readings of E—the Codex Estensis in Modena—being now for the first time fully reported for the scholia. The collation of manuscripts and the tabulation of all this manuscript evidence are a great service which will lighten the labors of the student of the future.

More than two hundred new conjectural readings, including some by friends of the editor, notably Professor Capps, are either adopted in the text or suggested in the notes. Nearly all will be readily accepted; some are very good; but in the nature of things a few are open to criticism. An objection to the emendation $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ for $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in schol. *Av.* 17 is the use of the article with the predicate, i.e., δ $\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. For the predicate without the article compare $\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ in line 12 of this scholium, and schol. 762, 876 ($\kappa\omega\mu\omicron\phi\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$), 168, 290 ($\delta\iota\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$). The same objection applies to the conj. $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu\alpha\varsigma$, schol. 450. The conj. $\eta\acute{\xi}\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ for $\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\iota\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ in schol. 96 is attractive but questionable: attractive because it explains $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$, but questionable because it occurs nowhere in the literature as the third person plural of the indicative, whereas the somewhat more regular form of the perfect $\eta\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ does occur (cf. Lobeck, *Phryn.* 744; Mayser 372), especially in the Septuagint. If $\eta\acute{\xi}\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ is kept, it must be regarded either as a late aorist like $\epsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota$ (cf. Hatzidakis, *Einkl.*, S. 112), though $\pi\rho\omicron\eta\acute{\xi}\alpha\nu$ is found in Clem. *Homil.* 12, 3, or as a perfect formed with the ending $-\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota$, like $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\xi\alpha\sigma\iota$ and $\iota\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota$. In the latter case some confusion would arise in view of forms of the aorist $\eta\acute{\xi}\alpha$ which occur in Pausanias, Galen, and the New Testament. Professor Wright's emendation $\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\eta}\xi\epsilon\iota$ and Clausen's punctuation are unnecessary in schol. 228, since the first aorist of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ is common enough in late Greek. $\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ in this sense is familiar; cf. *Ach.* 11, schol. *Av.* 1242. A proverb is likely to be a statement rather than a question, and so the order of words in the MSS should not be changed in schol. 369. The manuscript reading $\omicron\iota\omega\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ might well be kept in schol. 719, as being more common than $\omicron\pi\nu\iota\varsigma$ in the secondary meaning *omen*. Better than the editor's $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\rho\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$

in schol. 1247 are the previous conjectures *ἐνέρραπται*, *προέρραπται*, and *προσέρραπται*. *ἐκράπτω* does not occur elsewhere, nor does it give a suitable meaning here. The conj. *τὸν ὄνοκίνδιον αὐτοῦ* is not as good as *τὸ* (sc. *ὄνομα*) *ὄνοκίνδιον αὐτοῦ* of the MSS in schol. 1559, for while the former is intended to mean "his nickname *ὄνοκίνδιος*," it may also mean "his donkey-driver." Rutherford's *τὸ ὄνοκίνδιον αὐτὸν εἶναι* gives the sense required.

Professor White reads *κηρύλλος* with the manuscripts in the text of Aristophanes (Av. 299), against all the editors except Bergk. "The form *κηρύλλος* is a pure fiction," says he. "To foist it into the text of Aristophanes is a mistake, since it is not the poet's practice to explain his puns." Again in Av. 307 he differs from all the editors in reading *πιπιζουσι* rather than *πιπιζουσι*.

Among the valuable contents of the book one must not fail to mention the three excellent indexes compiled by Professor Capps which greatly facilitate its use, and the editor's full account of the manuscripts of Aristophanes that contain scholia on the *Birds*. The completeness and the high character of the work, and the scholarship, sound judgment, and fine discrimination of its author make us hope that he will not keep us waiting long for similar editions of the scholia on the other plays.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER

TRINITY COLLEGE

Menschen- und Weltenwerden. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Mikrokosmosidee. VON KONRAT ZIEGLER. Leipzig u. Berlin: Teubner, 1913. Pp. 45.

The myth concerning the origin of man put into the mouth of Aristophanes in the Platonic *Symposium* is the subject of the investigation of Professor Ziegler in this monograph, now reprinted from *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, XXXI, 529 ff., with the addition of an autotype cut of a relief at Modena supposed to represent the birth of Phanes.

What the author claims to establish is outlined on p. 568, and is as follows:

(1) the *Symposium* myth parodies Empedocles and Anaximander; (2) it touches very closely upon the account of man's creation in Gen., chap. 2; (3) it is an analogue of the Orphic cosmogony. We find that, more exactly, he believes that Plato parodied an unknown philosopher who devised a cosmogonic system based upon Orphism but made to agree with Empedocles to a certain extent.

The study falls into two parts, taking up the philosophical and the mythological connections of the *Symposium* myth respectively. The general fact of a metamorphosis of the human race, which took place before its natural propagation was possible, is common to the myth and Anaximander (pp. 533-34) and leads Professor Ziegler to find in the latter a *Vorbild* (p. 546). This may perhaps be doubted; there is nothing else in common between the two,

and not only does Empedocles furnish a more probable source for Aristophanes' foolery, but, it seems to me, a sufficient one without calling in the aid of Anaximander. It is also to be remarked that Anaximander does not so surely as Professor Ziegler thinks furnish an example of the macrocosmos-microcosmos comparison (cf. Diels, *Vorsokr.*, 3d ed., p. 16, 16 ff. and p. 21, 7 ff.; Ziegler, p. 567), if we accept the contention of Professor Heidel that Anaximander speaks of a circular and not a spherical world (see *Proc. Am. Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, XLVIII, 686 ff., and *Classical Philology*, I, 279 ff.).

The author very carefully works out the similarities between the *Symposium* myth and the doctrines of Empedocles, at the same time mentioning with at least partial approval Bury's reference to Hippocrates as a source (p. 532). As, according to the myth, there were at first spherical beings, double-faced and double-breasted, so Empedocles declares that at first there existed various separate bodily members, which, in what may be called the second stage, were united indiscriminately by Love, producing among others something like the Aristophanic monsters (frgg. 57-61 Diels). This generation, incapable of self-perpetuation, perished. Only when self-propagating beings arose did normal man exist (frgg. 62-64); so, in the myth, men were loosed by the device of Zeus from their constant embracing of one another and given *Lebens- und Fortpflanzungsmöglichkeit* (p. 541). Love enters prominently into both narratives (*ibid.*). Professor Ziegler recognizes that Aristophanes does not use the common motives in the same order and to the same purpose as Empedocles (p. 545). His additions to the narrative are sometimes pure comic fiction, sometimes strokes taken from mythology. Granting that it is only the salient features of the Empedoclean system, not its details, that suggested the trend of Aristophanes' speech, one is disposed to agree that there may be a real relation between the two, and the author's service in so carefully investigating all possible points of contact between them is highly to be commended. But the commonplace parallels of detail are not so convincing as the case taken as a whole.

Turning to mythology, and especially to the Orphic cosmogonic myths, the author finds here the source of many of the details of the Aristophanic story. The spherical shape of the double men and their insolence to the gods he thinks were suggested by the giants and monsters of mythology; so, too, the method whereby the double men were propagated calls to mind among others the Greek myth of the birth of Erichthonios (pp. 554-55). The later creation of woman, involved in the narrative, is characteristic of Hesiodic tradition (*ibid.*),¹ but the peculiar way in which she was made, according to Aristophanes, that is, by division, finds no counterpart in Greek anthropogony. It does, however, remind us of the account given in Gen., chap. 2 (pp. 557 ff.), and Professor Ziegler strongly believes that this ultimately

¹ On p. 556 the remark is made that the quintessence of the Pandora myth is that a new, less happy, age was introduced by the creation of woman. It should be noted that C. Robert, in *Hermes*, xlix, 17 ff., argues that Pandora was originally the earth goddess.

Babylonian tradition influenced the various Orphic doctrines of the world-egg and its division into male and female parts, which in turn suggested the cutting apart of the double men in the *Symposium* (pp. 560 ff.). So the double men of Aristophanes are microcosmoi (p. 566); as the world is divided, so are they.¹

Thus Professor Ziegler distinguishes two influences exercised upon the *Symposium* myth, that of Empedocles and that of the Orphics, and in order to explain how this came about he postulates the existence of the Empedoclean-Orphic Anonymus mentioned above, who combined features of both systems and was Plato's immediate source. . . Aristophanes, who twice in his extant plays satirizes Orphism, would more properly be represented as jesting at the Orphics than at Empedocles (p. 570). This of course is only a conjecture, and an argument might be made against its necessity; granting that the material Plato uses is not original but even very old, must we assume that Plato was not capable of himself mingling in one context for comic effect the ideas of many men—the more incongruous the better?

Professor Ziegler's arguments are all interesting and suggestive, some of them convincing; but to secure the complete concurrence of scholarly opinion throughout the complexities of so involved a subject, calling often for conjectural explanation, would be well-nigh impossible. The use of fragmentary text material, over-ready assumption of the existence of real literary parallels, and the nice distinction between actual sources and the far less tangible ancestry of those ideas which filter down from age to age and finally become incorporated in literature—all these have their perils for the investigator. Professor Ziegler, I think, has for the most part avoided these pitfalls, and thus presents in this monograph a valuable study of an important question.

FRANK EGGLESTON ROBBINS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Aristotle on the Art of Poetry. An amplified version with supplementary illustrations for students of English. By LANE COOPER. New York: Ginn & Co., 1913. Pp. xxix+101. \$0.80.

Though the author, who is assistant professor of English in Cornell University, is hopeful that his work will not be without suggestiveness even to classical scholars, it is primarily intended for students of literature in

¹ It is to be noted that Professor Ziegler finds a reference to the division of the world-egg in the supposedly Orphic cosmogonic passages, Euripides *Melanippe* fr. 484 and Apoll. Rhod. I. 494 ff. This involves the assumption that the *μορφή* referred to in each is that of an egg, corresponding to other Orphic sources. The usual view is that the word indicates something like the chaos of Hesiod *Theog.* 116 ff. (cf. Ovid *Met.* I. 6-7), and, as Miss Harrison remarks about the Hesiod passage (*Prolegomena*, 627), if the poet meant that the chaos was egg-shaped, he does not say so.

general and of English literature in particular. He thinks that these "gain less on a first acquaintance with the *Poetics* in any modern translation than their efforts commonly deserve." To this end he has first of all subdivided the translation into small sections and provided it with marginal glosses, often as many as four or five to a page. Secondly, he has expanded the text by frequent interpolations, printed in the same type as the translation itself. These insertions often occupy a page and in one instance three pages; all but the short ones are inclosed in brackets. They serve different purposes, sometimes merely marking a transition, amplifying an elliptical saying, or explaining an obscure point; sometimes emphasizing matters the importance of which might not be foreseen at a first reading or guarding against misconceptions; frequently suggesting that Aristotle's principles "have a wider application than his own illustrations, drawn solely from Greek literature, may serve to reveal." Such interpolated illustrations are taken chiefly from English literature and are supplied "in the spirit of the original." It may be stated at once that these devices and additions result in a book which cannot be otherwise than helpful to the readers for whom it was primarily written.

Professor Cooper lays no claim to independent authority as a Greek student but relies chiefly upon Bywater, "from whose conception of the text," he says, "I have but seldom intentionally departed." He acknowledges minor dependence upon Margoliouth, Butcher, and Tyrwhitt. In this I think he has not always been wise. Butcher's fourth edition, corrected in 1911, embodied that scholar's judgment upon Bywater's edition of 1909 and is not lightly to be set aside. In my opinion, Cooper incorrectly followed Bywater and rejected Butcher in explaining the two natural causes of poetry in 1448b4 and 20 (p. 10), in elucidating the phrase πολιτικῶς λέγοντας in 50b7 (p. 26), and in punctuating and interpreting 60a35 (p. 83). But in such matters there is, of course, ample room for difference of opinion.

For classical scholars the book's value will consist principally in the modern parallels adduced, of which I cite some of the more apposite and important. Erasmus Darwin's versified botany is quoted as a parallel to Empedocles' metrical science (p. 4). Rembrandt's "Lesson in Anatomy" illustrates Aristotle's statement that we may admire in a painting what is repulsive in nature (p. 10). *Beowulf* and *Don Juan* exemplify the mistaken notion that a plot must needs have unity if it deals with one personage throughout (p. 30). Act IV of *The Merchant of Venice* shows a double reversal of action, since Portia's argument at first cheers Shylock and discourages Antonio but later has the opposite effect; and recognition and reversal are combined in Joseph and his brethren (p. 36). "Man's first disobedience" in *Paradise Lost*, the jealousy of Othello, Macbeth's ambition, and Lear's rashness are included under the ἀμαρτία from which tragic themes are produced (p. 41). Scott's *Bride of Lammermoor* displays the truly tragic ending, but *Ivanhoe* yields to the public's weakness for a happy dénouement

(p. 43). Aristotle criticizes most severely the situation which results when someone, though aware of the relationship, seems about to do his kinsman a deadly injury and refrains; such a situation occurs in *Hamlet*, III, iii (p. 47). Baseness beyond what is necessary for the plot is seen in the Edmund and Regan of *King Lear*; inappropriateness to the manly type in the title rôle of *King Richard II*, and to the womanly in the clever speech of Portia at the trial in *The Merchant of Venice*; and inconsistency in the Oliver at the beginning and end of *As You Like It* (p. 50). Both external tokens and reasoning are used to bring about a recognition in *The Winter's Tale* (pp. 53 and 57), and a display of feelings caused by memory is employed for the same purpose in *Paradise Lost*, IV (p. 55). Failure to visualize the action accounts for certain inconsistencies in *King Lear* (p. 58). Shakespeare is a poet of the plastic sort, Marlowe one with the touch of madness (p. 59). The meaning of what Aristotle called the intellectual element is clearly elucidated from Claudius, Iago, and Hamlet (pp. 64 f.). Satan's speeches in *Paradise Lost* illustrate the difference between the morally good and the artistically good in literature (p. 88). How far these parallels are new needs no detailed consideration here. I judge that Professor Cooper himself would not claim originality for all of them. Certainly few of them lie beyond the ken of the ordinary classical scholar. It might be expected that a specialist in another department would be able to enlighten us more. But perhaps Hilly's dictum holds true here: "Truth, wherever it may be sought, is, as a rule, so simple that it does not look learned enough."

ROY C. FLICKINGER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Dioniso: Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane.

By A. CARLO PASCAL. Catania: Francesco Battiato, 1911.

Pp. xv+259. L. 5.

This book is a series of graceful essays, conceived in a popular manner, though fortified with a considerable apparatus of footnotes, about one-third of which is devoted to Dionysus and the Mysteries in partial justification of the main title. The author has a contagious admiration for Aristophanes, and enlivens his pages with an occasional exclamation of pleasure and approval.

Pascal's general conclusions are substantially sound. He expresses them thus: "That the elements of the comic representation of different divine personages were already contained in embryo in literary and popular tradition, and markedly so in tragedy" (referring here especially to the satyr plays; cf. pp. 57 ff.); ". . . that Aristophanes, like so many others of the ancients, has a purely political conception of religion," whence, given his passionate local patriotism, it follows that "the satire of the poet is implacable

against gods of foreign origin," and in him "the Athenian prejudice is dominant, subordinating to itself every other spiritual activity and every other conception, even in the field of the religious life" (pp. 252 f.). The strength of the work lies in its lucid narrative and exposition, and in its happy characterization of the spirit of Aristophanic satire, and it should be greatly appreciated by a cultured reading public which has not perhaps wholly disappeared as yet upon the Continent.

The specialist also will find not a few interesting theories and interpretations. Some will undoubtedly commend themselves, as, for example, the combination of frgg. 645 and 655 of Koch's edition (p. 156), and the really brilliant argument that the mysterious hero Orestes of the *Acharnians* and the *Birds* can be understood only in connection with the Orestes of the *Xóes* and the peculiar ritual of that feast. Pascal conjectures with great plausibility that originally some man feigning intoxication, i.e., possession by the god, stripped and beat (as at the Lupercalia) chance comers in an act of lustration. Certainly the old footpad theory is demolished, whether applied in a generic or a specific sense, even if the new view may not quite amount to a demonstration.

Most of the contributions, however, can neither inspire confidence or claim plausibility. Pascal belongs to that school, which, though growing less numerous, will probably never disappear, that persists in taking Aristophanes quite too seriously as a reformer. With such a presupposition you may support almost any contention from some portion of his works, but very few indeed from the whole. Pascal's whole treatment of Dionysus, for example, is vitiated by the assumption of a serious ulterior motive. We may grant that Aristophanes was violently opposed to strange gods, and in the *Ἦραι* would eradicate them root and branch, but it is quite inconceivable that he should have been *un oppositore dei riti dionisiaci* (p. 45), and have regarded Dionysus wholly as *un dio barbaro* (p. 65), *falso e bugiardo* (p. 33), or that he saw in the cult merely "a symbol of the triumph of democracy and a menace to social order" (p. 47). Aristophanes was a moderate democrat himself; surely no one can doubt that after Croiset. And if Dionysus plays a stupid and silly rôle in the *Frogs*, yet the phallic procession of the rural Dionysia in the *Acharnians* is treated with genuine sympathy and approval. Besides, if to laugh at Dionysus meant to attack the very cult itself, as was the case with Sabazius, then Aristophanes must have had sinister designs upon the cults of Zeus, Hermes, and Herakles, not to mention others who are treated, Zeus in particular, certainly no better than Dionysus. Again, whatever the early status of Dionysus among the Olympians, he had been worshiped in the countryside from almost immemorial antiquity, his cult being associated with many of the oldest names in Attic constructed history, while his worship had been established for nearly a century and a half in Athens itself, and without it the very existence of tragedy and comedy would have been inconceivable. That Euripides calls Dionysus *μαρτύρ᾿*

ἀνθρώπων means nothing in view of the fact that Poseidon and Plutus are addressed by the same phrase (*Birds* 1638 and *Plutus* 78). Finally, if Aristophanes' ridicule of Dionysus is to be taken seriously, then a general conspiracy on the part of the whole guild of comic poets to overthrow the worship of Dionysus must be assumed, for they had crowded the boards with representations of "a hungry Heracles, a cowardly Dionysus, and an adulterous Zeus" (schol. to the *Peace* 741), while Eupolis, Crates, and many another showed a marked preference for making Dionysus the butt of their jibes.

Again, it seems quite impossible that the *Frogs* is a counterblast to the *Bacchae*, as Pascal labors at great length to establish (pp. 36 ff.), partly because the *Bacchae* was certainly not produced at Athens before the *Frogs*, and it is improbable that Aristophanes could have known about its contents while composing his play, and partly because there is no direct reference where such would have been eminently in place, and the supposed "indirect" references are wholly vague and inconclusive. One might observe in passing that Koch, on the basis of vs. 320 and W. Schmid on that of vs. 631, had suggested the possibility of a reference to the *Bacchae*, but Pascal does not use either of these passages, and seems to be unaware that the suggestion had been made before.

It is difficult likewise to accept the identification of Basileia in the *Birds* with the Queen of the Nether World (pp. 99 ff.). This Basileia has no attributes of a death-goddess, but resides with Zeus in heaven; she is wholly unknown to Pithetaerus and is so described and treated as to make it quite clear that she is a mere invention of the poet, devised in part to symbolize the transfer of sovereignty from the gods to the birds, and especially to bring the play to a brilliant conclusion with a wedding-feast somewhat like that of Trygaeus and Opora in the *Peace*. Finally, the suggestion that a marriage with Basileia as Queen of Death meant a sudden transfer to the next world is both too subtle and wholly out of keeping with the context.

Pascal can hardly be right in claiming that Asclepius is made the object of ridicule in the *Plutus* (pp. 169 ff.). To be sure, as a physician the god must put up with some bad smells, but his treatment of Plutus is a pronounced success, and Neocles gets his just deserts. Whatever satire there is falls on the priests; but that is a very different matter.

The last chapter is devoted to an unsuccessful attempt to prove that Socrates "of the first manner" was really a physical scientist, as depicted in the *Clouds*. This view is based primarily on the assumption that Aristophanes was incapable of a serious misrepresentation (p. 238), a position amply refuted by the notorious unfairness of his treatment of Pericles and Euripides, to mention no others. The supplementary arguments are for the most part quite inconclusive. Certainly such a comparison as that of the *μαίεως* with the miscarriage of the idea when Strepsiades knocked rudely at the door of the *φροντιστήριον*, or of Δῖνος with the *οὐράναι δῖνα νεφέλας*

δομαίον of the Alceſtis, is very far from constituting ſubſtantial evidence.

A few obvious ſlips like the ſtatement that the *Protagoras* of Plato was earlier than the *Birds* (p. 148, note 1), that Polycrates wrote a defence of Socrates rather than an accusation (p. 237), or the aſſumption that the *Kaivón* in the *Wasps*, vs. 120, was a center of Corybantic worſhip inſtead of a law court (p. 171), while not ſeriously affecting the argument, do nevertheless, in conjunction with the aſtoniſhingly numerous miſprints in citations from Greek texts, mar ſomewhat the appearance of the book, at leaſt for the faſtidious.

W. A. OLDFATHER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Poetae Latini Minores. Poſt Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Vol. II, fasc. 3. *Homerus Latinus.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. Pp. x+65. M. 2.

Zum Homerus Latinus. Kritiſcher Apparat mit Commentar und Überlieferungsgeschichte. Von F. VOLLMER. Sitzungsberichte der königlich bayeriſchen Akademie der Wiſſenſchaften, philoſophiſch-philologiſche und hiſtoriſche Klaſſe. Jahrgung 1913, 3. Abhandlung. Pp. 152. M. 3.

We have in theſe two publications the mature fruit of collections and ſtudies that extend over ſome fifteen years. Briefly to ſummarize the formal contributions to the text criticism of the *Homerus Latinus*, all eight manuſcripts uſed by Baehrens have been recollated, and, as one familiar with this ſide of his work might readily believe, numerous corrections made; ſix hitherto unuſed manuſcripts of the tenth to the twelfth century have been added, one of which, diſcovered by Vollmer himſelf at Antwerp, together with a manuſcript of Valenciennes, conſtitutes a wholly independent arm of the tradition; ſeven of the earlieſt editions between 1477 and 1513 have been examined, and ſelected readings from them reported; a full liſt has been drawn up of all recorded *codices* from the time of the oldeſt catalogues to the preſent day, including more than ſixty now in exiſtence, a dozen or ſo of which have been examined and reported upon, and a few, notably the Helmiſtadtienſis 384 and the Vindobonenſis 3509, laid under contribution for important reſults; and finally, a reſtatement has been made, with occaſional corrections and elaborations, of the manuſcript claſſification ſet up in part in the *Festschrift Joh. Vahlen* (1900), and in greater detail, under Vollmer's ſuperviſion, by his pupil Remme in a Munich diſſertation (1906). All this has been done, it need ſcarcely be added, with that maſtery of technique and critical acumen which is characteristic of Vollmer's work as an editor, and conſtitutes the moſt notable addition yet made to our knowledge of this text.

Even more important is the contribution to the understanding of the author, but unfortunately this cannot be summarized. Numerous passages have received their definitive interpretation, and it would be tempting to give examples, did space permit. And yet the dagger-mark of despair appears frequently enough, for Vollmer is conservative in the constitution of the text, and few editors have exercised more self-restraint in printing their own suggestions. The principal emendations I have noted are in vss. 246, 286, 601, 751, 891, 983, and 1010, all quite convincing, except possibly vs. 983, where a brief statement of reasons would have been helpful. In vs. 286 the rare *regemet* has been restored with certainty from *regem et* of the archetype. To the instances cited in the commentary may now be added Avianus 42. 8, where some manuscripts preserve the correct *regemens* and errors in the others point clearly to the same form. There should also be noted an important change in punctuation in vs. 489, the establishment of a lacuna after vss. 385 and 696, and the determination of the correct position of vs. 790, i.e., after 793.

Of course not everyone will agree with each conclusion reached by the editor. I should be inclined to dissent, for example, in two instances where the reading of the archetype has been changed, as it appears to me, with scarcely sufficient warrant. In vs. 900, instead of *laetis in arvis* (so Barth for the impossible *armis*), Vollmer accepts Bondam's *Latiis*. The phrase may not be wholly perspicuous or satisfactory, yet Vergil's *laeta arva* of Elysium (A. 6. 744), and *illic res laetae* of Latium (A. 2. 783), both cited by Vollmer, give it some support, while just such a word as *laetis* serves to contrast the present scenes of war and peril with the felicity of Aeneas' future destinies, and to foreshadow the peace and prosperity of the *Augustum genus* which the poet would honor. Again in vs. 216 Schrader's emendation *Oileos* has been accepted in place of the archetype's *Oileus*. Hyginus, Dares, and Dictys may be but bruised reeds on which to support our manuscripts at this point, but surely Seneca's use of *Oileus* = the son of Oileus (*Medea* 661), followed and so supported by Sidonius 5. 196 f., makes this reading to say the least possible. The peculiar AIAX OILIOS (or ILIOS?) of a *cista Praenestina* (CIL, XIV, 4108) may perhaps point in the same direction.

The most general interest, however, of these studies, and indeed perhaps their greatest value, lies in the elaborate critical commentary where thousands of variants are once for all carefully recorded and in the many elaborate discussions of text history and manuscript classification. Numerous typical cases of errors in tradition are discussed, with rich illustrative material, glosses, simplifications of word order and of construction, mistakes in initial letters, emendations both learned and impudent, interpolations of familiar parallels—in a word the countless pitfalls to which the text tradition of a popular classical author, especially one read widely in the schools, was subject. The method is detailed, severe, and objective; it succeeds, as far perhaps as that end can ever be reached, in elevating text criticism to the rank of a science. It

would be hard to find a critical commentary better adapted as a model for philological exercises in a pro-seminar, where it would furnish an excellent addition and supplement to Lindsay's brilliant *Introduction*.

Among minor points of interest might be noted Vollmer's acceptance of the name Baebius Italicus for the author, as given in the late Vindob. 3509, together with convincing arguments for its correctness (pp. 16, 142 f.); the suggestion that the mediaeval ascription to Pindarus is due solely to a misunderstanding of Bishop Benzo's *Pindarus seu Homerus*, by which really the Greek authors were meant (p. 143, nn. 1 and 2); and that the well-known vss. 900 f. point rather to the period of the Flavian emperors than to that of the Claudian. An interesting separate report upon the early printed editions, from 1477 to 1541, has been made by the skilled hand of Dr. Fr. Bock, of Erlangen. The printer has unfortunately marred somewhat the appearance of the Greek citations by the almost uniform use of a Latin italic *c* for uncial sigma, and of three separate fonts for minuscule theta.

W. A. OLDFATHER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Aegyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer. Von DR. JUR. MARIANO SAN NICOLÒ. Erster Band. München: Beck, 1913. Pp. viii+225.

Three very different legal and economic systems successively influenced the development of the "Vereinswesen" of Egypt; in none of them was a clear distinction drawn between public and private corporations and associations. Dr. San Nicolò, therefore, well aware of the complications and ramifications of his subject, very wisely defines the scope of his study by a few specific exclusions, and arranges his material according to the aims and activities of the organizations which it represents. The clubs and societies found in Egypt during the period dealt with are grouped in five chapters, which deal respectively with "Kultvereine," "Vereine von Altersgenossen," "Agonistische Vereine," "Berufsvereine," "Private und sonstige Vereine." Of the great mass of facts presented, only a few of the most interesting and important can be mentioned here.

Cult societies first made their appearance in Egypt in the Hellenistic period, but were speedily adapted to the worship of the native divinities and seem to have played an important part in the struggle of paganism against Christianity. With Hellenism came also the institution of the gymnasia and ephebic service, which were the source of numerous organizations, both large and small, composed of age-fellows. Agonistic societies, too, are found, among them the Dionysiac players. Perhaps the most striking array is that of the "Berufsvereine," which range from guilds of brewers and bartenders (if I may so translate *ζυτοπῶλαι*), bakers and beekeepers, gravediggers and

gooseherds, to societies of physicians and philosophers. If anything more be needed to give the modern touch, we hear of monopolies in various commodities. Among the most important documents are several which have to do with *ἱεραὶ*. They support the view that *ἱεραὶ* were not at all times simple cult societies, but were, at least in some instances, mutual credit associations.

Dr. San Nicolò's work as a whole presents most vividly the Greek fondness for clubs and associations and its profound effect upon the life and institutions of the Hellenistic world. Many of the details which are here developed are extremely suggestive to the student of the clubs and societies of the classic period, as for example the adoption of cults and cult-names by organizations whose aims were primarily social or economic, the masking of political activity by religious or convivial practices, the origin of clubs and societies in the association of the gymnasia or ephebic classes, etc. Dr. San Nicolò has made a valuable collection of material and has handled it in a thoroughly scholarly way. It is to be regretted that the pleasing format of the book is marred by a number of typographical errors.

GEORGE MILLER CALHOUN

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Nekyia. Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse.

By ALBRECHT DIETERICH. Zweite Auflage. Leipzig-Berlin:

B. G. Teubner. Pp. xvi+238.

This second edition of another of Dieterich's fundamental studies upon the relationship between the eschatology of the syncretistic religion of the Hellenistic mysteries and the equally syncretistic eschatology of the Christian apocalypses becomes at once, like the second edition of the *Mithras Liturgie*, and in the literal sense of the word, a standard work for all students of comparative religion. For the new edition is a norm for measuring the rapid advance made by the profound studies of the past twenty years in this important field of spiritual relationships. By means of the *Nachträge* of Wunsch (pp. vi-xiv) we may test the extent to which a changed temper has come to animate such comparative studies.

The task of the first edition was to trace similarities. The temper of this as of nearly all of Dieterich's studies is that of the pioneer. He is primarily concerned with the collection and analysis of fundamental similarities, with establishing the broad limits, the common spiritual heredity, which determine the great *genera* of ancient religious thought. The time for observing the individual variations and modifications wrought by race, creed, and teacher, which result in the later splittings into the minuter species under Gnosticism, neo-Platonism, Christian Mysticism, had hardly then arrived. Of the new temper, however, with its proper preoccupation with such intensive study of differences, the recent work of Carl Clemen,

Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen auf das älteste Christentum, may serve as an example.

Since the *Nachträge* of Wünsch is the best index of the extent to which Dieterich's original thesis has been accepted and buttressed by new evidence or modified as the result of subsequent assaults, it will be well to cite a few examples illustrating the trend of more recent investigations.

In chap. i, "Griechische Volksglaube vom Totenreich," while the theory of Elysium as a land of happiness lying in the west is partly a figment of the imagination, it seems clear that mariners' legends played an important part in molding such conceptions (cf. the bibliography quoted in the *Nachträge*, p. vii, l. 2). On p. 25 Dieterich's interpretation of Lycia as light-land and Phoenicia as red-land has properly been criticized by H. Lewy, *Berl. Philol. Wochenschr. klass. Phil.*, p. 917. On p. 35, l. 10, we may now refer to the article by O. Schröder, "Hyperboreer," *Archiv für Rel. Wiss.*, VIII (1905), 69 ff. In chap. ii, "Mysterienlehren über Seligkeit und Unseligkeit," p. 80, l. 4, the theory of the symposium of the blessed in Elysium is discussed by Karl Kircher, "Der Sakrale Bedeutung des Weins im Alterthum," *Relig. Vers. und Vorarb.*, IX, 2, 56 ff. In chap. iii, "Orphische-Pythagoreische Hadesbücher," pp. 114-18, we have references to the attempt of R. Eisler, *Weltmantel und Himmelzelt*, I, 97, to trace back the Platonic myth of Er to Iranian sources, and to the studies of Norden on the Platonic myths. One misses, however, a reference to *The Myths of Plato* by J. A. Stewart (Macmillan). On p. 128, the articles by E. Kuhnert, "Orpheus in der Unterwelt," *Philol.*, LIV, 193 ff., and A. Milchöfer, *ebenda*, supplement Dieterich's discussion upon the Ὀρφικὸς ἐκ Αἴδου καταβάσις. The theories of Norden as to the relations of Virgil's *Seelenwanderungslehre* in *Aeneid* vi (set forth in the introduction and commentary to his edition of the sixth book *passim*, and especially p. 52 in the *Einleitung*) with two Orphic *καταβάσεις* of Heracles and Orpheus may well be added. In chap. iv as supplementary to the types of sins and penalties, the references on p. 170 to Zöckler, *Das Lehrstück von dem 7 Hauptsünden*, München, 1893, *Bibl. und Kirchen hist. Stud.*, Heft 3, and on p. 206 to the article by E. Gortein, "Das Vergeltungsprinzip im biblischen und talmudischen Strafrecht," *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, XIX (1892) and XX (1893), are especially important.

In general the feeling of admiration for the depth, range, and scholarly precision of Dieterich's great study is but augmented by the second edition. While certain of the finely pointed salients of the original thesis have crumbled under the attrition of later investigations, the broad and deeply based outlines of the whole loom majestic and firm. The whole system of sins and penalties revealed in the Christian apocalypse of Akmim has been shown definitely, we may now say, to rest upon the Orphic-Pythagorean eschatology with but few and superficial accretions from later syncretistic Jewish theological sources.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE

Kennt Aristoteles die sogenannte tragische Katharsis? Von HEINRICH OTTE. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1912. Pp. 59. M. 1.60.

The tardiness of this review was partly unavoidable and partly due to a desire to weigh again carefully the argument of Margoliouth, whom Otte dismisses very curtly. Otte follows and enlarges upon Joseph Egger in his destructive criticism of Bernays and he is not more successful than was Knoke. It is a beaten road, beginning with attacks upon details, such as Bernays' effort to distinguish *πάθη* from *παθήματα* and ending in much ridicule of a theory that reduces the theater to a psychiatric asylum. It is a relief to know from Margoliouth that at least Bernays' "personal character . . . is pleasing." But a metaphor is not an enunciation of Euclid and the essential consideration is whether Bernays was right or wrong in assuming that Aristotle coined a metaphor from the treatment of religious ecstasy. The fact that Aristotle uses the word *κάθαρσις* for the first time without the article and without comment (*Pol.* 1341a23), as Otte notes, may simply mean that the reference to such treatment is too obvious to require emphasis. If Aristotle prefixes the article to *κάθαρσιν* in the famous *locus* following (1341b39), it is only what we should expect; and here no juggling of words can destroy the conviction that he was as conscious of difficulty in the idea to be conveyed as of novelty in his use of the word. He can pause only to explain it *ἀπλῶς*, but he will explain it later on more clearly *ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς*. Now Otte finds it necessary for his argument to adopt the theory that Aristotle's reference is to a later discussion which he made or intended to make in the *Politics* of the use of poetry for *παιδεία, διαγωγή* (*Unterhaltung*), *ἀνείσις καὶ τῆς συντονίας ἀνάπνοις*. He goes even farther and supplies for us this missing doctrine of the social function of tragedy. The *κάθαρσις* of tragedy intended in the *Politics* is summed up, in short, in the verse of Timocles, *τίθησκε τῷ παῖς ἡ Νύξβη κεκούφικε*. In the *Poetics* no explanation occurs, simply because Aristotle is using *κάθαρσις* in a sense understood by all Greeks and requiring no comment.

What then does the definition of tragedy come to be? *Μίμησις* is the *σύστασις τῶν πραγμάτων, περαίνουσα* agrees with *μίμησις* not *τραγῳδία*. *Πραγμάτων* may be a better suggestion than Trincavelli's *παθημάτων* for the *μαθημάτων* of Ac. But in any case *παθημάτων* is here a synonym for *πραγμάτων* and Aristotle may have employed the word intentionally (cf. *τί' Ἀλκιβιάδης ἔπραξεν ἢ τί ἔπαθεν* 1451b11) to bring in the note of suffering. We may admit that all this certainly does no violence to the *Poetics*.

Finally we may paraphrase Otte's interpretation thus: Tragedy is the proper treatment of a grave subject that is an organic whole. Pity and fear constitute the essence of a tragic theme, and artistic treatment lies in stamping these on the incidents of the story. The *μαρὸν* and even the *φιλάνθρωπον* (1453a3) are not enough; indeed, the playwright must sift out

all *μαρά* from his material, and this *sifting out* is the *κάθαρσις* of the *Poetics*, and would be so understood by any Greek reader. Why not, we ask, add τὰ ἄλογα to the matter which requires to be sifted out? Because by reference to a passage in the *Odyssey*, another in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, another in the *Phaedo* you shall see that *μαρός* suggests itself to the mind as the opposite of *καθαρός*, and in the light of this possibility compare οὐ φοβερὸν οὐδὲ ἔλεινόν τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ μαρόν ἐστιν, 1452b39, as 1453b39 and 1454a3.

At this point we must part company with Otte. Each link except the last in his argument is made of genuine iron, but when put together they make, not a cable, but a watch-chain. It is singular, however, how many such investigations as Otte's, while mistaken as interpretation, are yet sound in aesthetic principles, raising problems of first-rate importance, but ending by bringing back the original difficulty. What is the alchemy by which the artist transforms some story of violence and sordid details into a thing of beauty? The incidents are indeed *purified*, but how is this achieved by the impress of pity and fear?

The writer still believes that the definition of tragedy includes the *ἔργον*. The *πόλις* is so defined in the *Politics*, and there is no more difficulty in accepting this addition here than in believing with Otte that Aristotle adds in the concluding line a hint of treatment for the playwright. Aristotle flatly asserts that the function of tragedy is to produce an effect which he describes as *κάθαρσις*. The effect of great tragedy upon the Greeks was what it is upon ourselves. We may presume that Aristotle was as much interested as we in the nature of this effect, and this presumption must be the starting-point of all attempts to unravel the problem.

The artificial nature of Otte's argument appears in his explanation of τὴν ἀπὸ ἐλείου καὶ φόβου διὰ μμήσεως ἡδονὴν (1453b12) by a reference to the *Rhetoric* 1371b4 ff.: πᾶν δ' ἂν εὖ μμημένον ἢ κἂν ἢ μὴ ἡδὺ αὐτὸ τὸ μμημένον. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦτ' αὖτε χαίρει, ἀλλὰ συλλογισμὸς ἐστὶν ὅτι τοῦτο ἐκείνο ὥστε μανθάνειν τι συμβαίνει (note particularly the next sentence)! So that the *οἰκεία ἡδονή* of the drama lies simply in a "convincing" presentation of a terrible and pitiful theme. Indeed, this is putting it more than fairly. It would be truer to say that it lies in mere *vraisemblance*. In short, if one submits Otte's main position to the same torture that he applies to Bernays', he might ask how impressing pity and fear upon the incidents may be said to *sift out* *μαρά*. By squeezing them out?

It is now in order for some victim of this greatest literary crux to work out an ingenious thesis from this *μανθάνειν τι συμβαίνει* by starting with *Poetics* 1448b16 and comparing *Politics* 1339a35-36, 1341a23-24, 1341b6. But, before setting out in pursuit of this will-o'-the-wisp, let anyone so tempted examine *Politics* 1340a1-14 and ask himself whether this is not a preliminary sketch of *κάθαρσις*.

To this great chapter of the *Politics* all argument must return. One line is sufficient to upset the whole argument of Margoliouth, i.e., ὁρᾶν εἰ πῃ

καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἥθος συντείνει (ἡ μουσικὴ) καὶ πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν. The *πάθη* of the melancholic men of genius, and of all of us in minor or occasional degree, as described in the *Problems*, § 30, are *σωματικά*. When *κάθαρσις* is resumed in the seventh chapter of *Politics* v, the language is metaphorical throughout. Now if *Problems*, § 30, suggests any treatment of these *πάθη*, it is a bottle of good wine, the *μέθη* of *Politics* 1339a20. Why turn to passages in Hippocrates for treatment which when examined contain no idea of homeopathy? As in the *Problems*, it is a matter of "feeding up" the element in defect, except in cases where, as a modern would put it, the vitality is too much depleted. The truth is that these *πάθη* on this higher plane are not to be extinguished, or purged away, or even purged themselves, but to be given their proper *τροφή*, which produces a high and legitimate delight, something very different from the *φυσικὴ ἡδονή* of music. This latter it is which is to be used *καυροφυλακούντα* (*Politics* 1337b41) as a drug, an anodyne for the stress of life. The former is of the same stuff as the high passion of *θεωρία*, pure, untiring, were we only gods, but since we are only men (see *Ethics* vii. 11-14) "it seldom happens," alas, "that we find ourselves at the goal" (*Politics* 1339b27).

As we sit, then, in our seats at the Dionysia, we do not require to sink back after the first tragedy into a former morbid condition, but we can go on to experience from a second and a third play a pleasurable excitation of emotions which are the better for being exercised, not starved, an experience for which we can find some parallel in the relief afforded to religious ecstasy by the sacred airs of Olympus. We shall tire at last, as we tire of speculation, but that is because we are human.

In any case the riddle of *κάθαρσις* can never be solved along the line of a purely philological investigation. The hints in the *Politics* are too scanty. It cannot be solved apart from the *Politics*, but it requires as a preliminary a thorough delving into the psychology of Plato and Aristotle.

W. S. MILNER

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
TORONTO

St. John Damascene, Barlaam and Ioasaph. With an English Translation by G. R. WOODWARD and H. MATTINGLY. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann; New York: Macmillan. Pp. xx+640. \$1.50.

Of the volumes of the Loeb Library the ones with which the present translation may best be compared are Professor Lake's *Apostolic Fathers*. The translators of St. John Damascenus have produced a far livelier version than Professor Lake, but are not so careful of their renderings; like him, they have forsaken the English of today for a dialect with a mediaeval flavor, but they have not kept so closely within bounds as he did. An examination

of this translation raises a few questions in one's mind regarding what is and what is not permissible in such matters for a Loeb translator. One cannot, to be sure, quarrel with the translator for choosing to use antiquated English, although one sometimes trembles for him when a phrase with a perilously modern sound reminds the reader that after all it is no Elizabethan that is writing, and perhaps even to an American ear "dis-fleshed" (p. 603) may have a somewhat uncanny sound; but one may well contend that in any translation, and particularly in one of the Loeb series, his desire to produce a smoothly flowing "literary" version should not lure the translator so far from the literal sense that one with little Greek, or one whose Greek is moribund or comatose, would frequently be unable to follow the text or even be wholly misled. It may be overzealous criticism to call attention to this, and especially in bespeaking a genial and graceful translation such as that of Messrs. Woodward and Mattingly; but it has impressed the reviewer that often the text could have been more closely rendered at no cost to the literary form and to the profit of the non-professional users of the library.

But this is really a well-executed translation and a useful one, giving as it does the first complete English version of *Barlaam and Ioasaph*, which is itself, despite prosiness and preaching, an interesting narrative full of the naïve superstition of early times and of the wisdom of the Fathers. There are, besides the version itself, a discussion of the question of authorship and a Life of St. John Damascenus, both brief, and at the back of the book a general index, a Greek index, and a Bible index of some value. Useful, too, are the marginal references to Scripture passages and the marginal headings which run along with the translation.

Among passages that the reviewer has noted for criticism the following may be cited: p. 16, end of 2d paragraph, τῶν ἡδέων καὶ ἀπολαυστικῶν τοῦ γλυκντάτου βίου, "the pleasures and enjoyments of the palace"; p. 10, οὕτως ἔχων τῆς γνώμης, "such his condition"; p. 20, νύττουσά μου τὴν ψυχὴν, "pricking my conscience." These three instances illustrate the cases referred to above; they might easily mislead a beginner, and could as easily be corrected. P. 12, τοῦ . . . πικροῦ τῆς ἀπάτης . . . σκοτούς is balanced by τῆς . . . γλυκεῖ τῆς ἀληθείας φωτί and can scarcely mean "the bitterness of the error of darkness"; p. 52 (cf. also p. 347), ὡς προῖον ὁ λόγος δηλώσει, "as our tale shall go on to tell"; p. 60, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ is "upon him," "in his case"; p. 194, top, ἐλπίδα, "help"; p. 238, . . . πολλῶν ἀπήλυσσα καὶ μεγίστων τοῦ Δεσπότου μου δωρημάτων, οὐμενοῦν ἐχόντων ἀριθμὸν ἢ εἰκασμῶ ὑποπιπτόντων, "many and great the blessings that I have enjoyed of my Lord, without number and beyond compare," fails to take account of the corrective force in οὐμενοῦν; p. 243, "I have already proved them and known how wise" ("know" better translates ἐγνωκα); p. 250, ὁ τῆς σοφίας χορηγός is better taken as the "giver" of wisdom than as the "leader"; p. 264, ἐχομένη τοῦτων means "joining them"; p. 362, ἀκηράτων should be "pure," not "imperishable"; p. 406, ὁ Ζεὺς, ὃν φασὶ βασιλεῦσαι τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, "who, they say, is

king of the gods," should be rather "who became king of the gods themselves," "the very gods" (one of the points of the argument is that it is absurd that the gods should have a king or that the king of the gods should masquerade).

For such a long text the volume seems remarkably free from typographical errors and lesser slips; but I have noted the following: p. 114, *εἰδάζαν*; p. 228, *ὠφελοντων*; p. 274, *γινώσκων* (faulty breathings or accents); p. 354, *εἰ-δεχθῆς* (wrong syllable division); "straight" for *τεθλιμμένην* on p. 47, but "strait" on pp. 22 and 157; p. 194, *οὐ σχολάζω σήμερον συναγωνίσασθαί σοι* is omitted in the translation, as is also, p. 240, *ταύτην προκρίνας τῆς αὐτοῦ δόξης*; a question mark is wrongly used for a period in p. 229, "'Would God,' said Ioasaph, 'that he too were instructed in these mysteries?'" (*sic*); the same mistake occurs on p. 417, ninth line from the bottom; p. 545, second line, "have" should be "has" (cf. the Greek); p. 559, line 8, "has" for "hast." On p. 400, *τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ* is read, but the variant *ὄντος* (which is noted) is translated.

The translators have contented themselves with Boissonade's Greek text and note but few variants. I suspect that a change should be made in p. 44, *ἐποίησε κατὰ δὴ καὶ αὐτῷ λελάληκεν*, reading either *καθό* or *καθά*. I have not been able to inspect Boissonade's text, but have noted that in the Migne edition *κατὰ* occurs.

FRANK EGGLESTON ROBBINS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Propertius with an English Translation. By H. E. BUTLER. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann; New York: Macmillan, 1912. Pp. xvi+363.

Professor Butler has equipped his translation with a brief Introduction on the Life of Propertius, the Manuscripts, the Division into Books, a Bibliographical Note, and an Explanatory Index. In the Introduction there are a great many errors of fact and some expressions of opinion with which few students of Propertius will agree. The cognomen Nauta, for example, is certainly not "demonstrably absurd" because "Propertius expresses the liveliest terror of the sea in his poems." Indeed, no convincing argument has ever been brought forward against the manuscript authority on this point, and of recent years scholars have even shown a disposition to retain Aurelius, which Professor Butler rejects for the traditional reasons; cf. Marx (*Lucilius*, II, 198), "librarios Aureli nomen temere addidisse Propertio in codicibus nondum demonstratum est: immo commendat poetae nomen duplex Aurelii Opilii grammatici ratio."

The text seems to be a slightly revised version of that contained in Professor Butler's complete edition of 1905, which was based upon the work of

Baehrens, Postgate, and Phillimore. The editor believes that the "text of Propertius is undoubtedly very corrupt. The sequence of thought is at times so broken that the reader necessarily concludes that one of two things has happened: (a) couplets have been lost, or (b) the order of the lines has been dislocated." This is an untenable position. The supposed dislocations of the thought are, in the vast majority of instances, merely a reflex of the elegiac mood. If we add to this generic incoherence those difficulties which are due to the very peculiar style of Propertius, we have accounted for a very large part of the supposed corruptions. The residue is no greater than one would expect of a text which rests upon manuscripts of the eleventh and later centuries.

Professor Butler's practice, however, is better than his theory. He accepts only a dozen or more than a thousand transpositions which have been proposed and he marks only half a dozen lacunae. In the more circumscribed difficulties which are so numerous in Propertius he has not always displayed the best judgment (cf. i. 2. 25; i. 8. 19; i. 17. 11; i. 18. 23, etc.), but his text is on the whole conservative and good.

In the Note on the Division into Books I miss a reference to Birt's attractive explanation of the *tres libelli*—the very explanation, apparently, for which Professor Butler is seeking; cf. Birt, *Antike Buchwesen* (1882) and *Rhein. Mus.*, LXIV (1909); Ullman, *Class. Phil.*, IV (1909).

Some errors have crept into the Bibliographical Note. Beroaldus did not publish the "first edition of Propertius." Lachmann, not Baehrens, "was the first to put the text on a scientific basis." Lachmann's edition of 1829 was not, as Professor Butler implies, a commentary. The date of Plessis' *Études sur Properce* is 1884, not 1886. Whatever the cause of these errors—perhaps the hurry with which the Loeb series is being rushed through the press—it is regrettable that the readers who may be stimulated to use this material should find it so inaccurate, for they are the very readers who should be made to feel that the series is reliable.

Translations of Propertius must be judged with more than ordinary charity. The difficulties are so great that, as Professor Butler says, "an apology for . . . deficiencies is . . . unnecessary." Indeed, a fitting caption for the attempt would have been the words of the poet about another insuperable task, *in magnis et voluisse sat est*. And yet Professor Butler would have succeeded far better if he had consistently maintained the only principle which he professes to follow—that of keeping close to the original. But closeness is very often directly opposed to Mr. Loeb's ideal of a rendering that shall be "a real piece of literature," and to this ideal the translator evidently inclines in spite of the fact that a prose translation of a Greek or Roman poet cannot be at the same time "a real piece of literature" and (in any true sense) a faithful rendering. The result in the present instance is but a loose approximation of Propertian values. The translation belongs in fact to the familiar type for which a sort of translation prose has been

developed—a style employed exclusively for the rendering of classical poets. This type of translation is usually explicit where the original is vague; it intrudes metaphors where the original has none, or changes unnecessarily those which exist; it expands and interprets, and the English is shot with an excess of archaisms and toplofty expressions. These are little things when viewed separately, but wrong pigments distort the finished picture and the constant recurrence of these little things makes of elegy something all too lofty. Elegy is often lofty, but it is often just the opposite; it is not epic nor even lyric, but a much more elastic medium than either. The system which Professor Butler follows causes him not infrequently to miss the many gradations of tone—especially the colloquial, which is so prominent in Propertius.

This translation, therefore, will appeal to those who like such renderings as “love-distraught” (*amens*), “the frown of heaven” (*adversos deos*), “in the gyves of love” (*in amore*), “by Colchian charms” (*Cytaeines . . . carminibus*), etc.—it will be reckoned good work of its type. But to the present reviewer the most successful passages are those which are least typical. The pretty renderings of ii. 11 and parts of iv. 8, for example, prove that the translator might have reached a high average of excellence if he had not chosen a wrong system.

ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

Xenophon Cyropaedia. Translated by WALTER MILLER. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann; New York: Macmillan. In 2 volumes. \$1.50.

The sketch of the life and works of Xenophon in the Introduction, though brief, gives the readers the point of view necessary for the appreciation of the work to follow.

The translation is an admirable example of clear readable English. It is free from pedantry and yet as precise as could be desired in the interpretation of the Greek text. In style it reproduces successfully the easy-going and semi-colloquial manner of the original. The precision of the translation is, perhaps, best seen in the particles. The author does not hesitate to devote a phrase or a clause to rendering the full meaning of an elusive particle or to supply the ellipsis arising from the combination of two particles. A few instances are *ἄρα* (“as it may well be”), i. 6. 41; *ὅς οἱ* (“be that as it may”), ii. 3. 11; *καὶ γάρ*, iv. 3. 3 and v. 1. 25; *ἀλλὰ γάρ*, vi. 2. 22; *καὶ γὰρ δὲ*, vii. 5. 11.

For the ellipsis “Then too he rather wished to stay where he was” in translating *καὶ γάρ* (iv. 1. 13) I should like to suggest “This too was to be expected.” The particles do not add any new idea but give the reason for *μὴ πάλιν κινδυνεύειν* to which Cyaxares refers again at the close of his speech—

ἀναγκάζειν κινδυνεύουσιντας ἵνα. In a few other passages also I am inclined to differ with the translator. The position of *ἔτι* before *οἰκοθεν* in ii. 2. 19 would point to the reading of *ἔτι* with *οἰκοθεν* rather than with *νομίζουσιν*. *οἰκοθεν* is not clearly rendered in the translation. The passage should read, "They consider the command of the army, perhaps, mine already by inherited right." For this meaning of *ἔτι* compare Thucyd. viii. 45; Plato *Meno* 93 A, *et al.* οὐκέτι, vii. 1. 39, seems to bear its usual force "no longer." That the Persian cavalry have already been attacking the Egyptians is shown by *ἦδη παιομένους* which the *καὶ γάρ* clause explains by mentioning the fact that the Persian cavalry had already arrived. In i. 6. 8, "to show respect" is too mild a rendering of *ὑποπτήξει* which always implies "crouching in fear before." The translator reads *ἔχων οἴσεις* in ii. 4. 31, but does not justify this most difficult reading either in critical footnote or in translation. *ἔχων ἀπείῃ*, adopted by most editors, seems much to be preferred. The point of the paragraph iii. 3. 9 is obscured by the translation of *τῆς καλῆς παρασκευῆς ἀλλοιούται τι* as "some even of their best laid plans brought to naught." The reference is rather to the deterioration in the morale of even excellently trained armies owing to delay. In iv. 1. 5, *ῥῆον ἀπαλλάττονσιν*, there would seem to be no reason for the deviation from the well-known idiomatic translation of *ἀπαλλάττονσιν*. Holden cites numerous examples in a note on this passage. There is no evidence for the use of this word for the military movement of withdrawal. In Xenophon the technical words are *ἀναχωρεῖν* and *ἐπανάγειν*.

For translating *εἰ τοῦτο λέγεις*, iv. 1. 23, "if you talk that way," I can find no support. The speaker Artabazus takes up Cyrus' jesting allusion to the former's devotion to himself when a boy and says, "If you mean by your remark that you wish to test this devotion I will prove it by never leaving you." The translation of *ἔγνω τά παρὰ τῆς γυναικὸς σύμβολα*, vi. 1. 46, by "read the cipher message sent by his wife," a modern equivalent, might be misleading to the casual reader. Why not render it simply "recognized the tokens sent by his wife"? The English text viii. 3. 14, *εἶτε καὶ τῷ ὄντι εἶτε καὶ ὅπως οὖν*, reads "but neither in reality nor in appearance so tall as he," an interpretation which neither the Greek nor the logic of the sentences would admit. The charioteer was tall, but shorter than Cyrus; whether he was in reality so or however it was, Cyrus appeared much taller. In viii. 1. 31 "considerateness" is not an apt word for *αἰδῶ* which is being contrasted with *σωφροσύνη*. A "sense of shame" would be closer to the original. There remains one more point—the meaning of *ἐξάλλομαι* in two passages, Cyr. vii. 1. 27, *οἱ δ' ἐξήλλοντο*, Cyr. vii. 1. 32, *ὑπὸ τῶν παντοδαπῶν σωρευμάτων ἐξαλλομένων τῶν τροχῶν*. The translation of the first reads, "others [horses] began to rear," of the second, "the wheels bounded over the heaps of every sort." Greek usage, however, seems to me to support the rendering of Holden, who for the first gives "*saltu facto deflectebant*," and for the second, "the wheels bounded off their axles."

The only other instance of ἐξάλλομαι in the sense "leap up" given in the lexicons is Xen. *Anab.* vii. 3. 33, καὶ αὐτὸς Σειθῆς ἀναστὰς ἀνέκραγε πολεμικὸν καὶ ἐξήλατο ὥσπερ βέλος φυλαττόμενος μάλα ἐλαφρῶς, where, as the verb refers to the imitation of the movements of βέλος φυλάττεσθαι, the better rendering would be "leap aside." The verb is used also in Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 8. 25 of "jumping out of a chariot," and again *De re equestri* viii. 4, διαπηδήσῃ δ' ἂν καὶ ἐξάλλοιτο καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα ὑπηρετοίῃ ἂν, where it must mean either "start forward" or "turn aside quickly," as rearing would hardly be an instance of τᾶλλα πάντα ὑπηρετοίῃ ἂν. In Homer *Il.* xv. 57; xvii. 342; xxiii. 399, it means "leap out from." Plutarch 341 B, ὥστε τῆς κερκίδος τό ὁστέον ἀποκλασθῆν ὑπὸ τῆς πληγῆς ἐξαλείσθαι, and Hipp. *Art.* 811 are close parallels to *Cyr.* vii. 1. 32. In both cases the verb plainly bears the sense "leap or start out from." For "leaping up" and "rearing" the usual Greek equivalents are ἀναπάλλομαι, *Il.* viii. 85 (of a horse); xxiii. 692; xx. 424; Pind. *O.* xiii. 102, ὀρθὸς ἴσταμαι; Herod ix. 22 (of a horse); ἀναχαιτίζω (of rearing and throwing rider), Eur. *Bacch.* 1072; Hipp. 1232, *et al.*; ἀναπηδῶ, Xen. *Cyr.* i. 4.2; ἀνοροῦω, Xen. *De re equestri* iii. 7.

The following textual errors occur, in the Greek, iii. 3. 12, παρῷ δὲ πρέσβει, for πρὸ δὲ παρέιναι, and iv. 5. 38, τὰ δέον ταῦν for τὰ δέοντα οὐ, in the English (Vol. II, p. 197), "chariat" for "chariot."

GENEVA MISENER

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
CANADA

Tacitus: Dialogus, translated by WILLIAM PETERSON; *Agricola* and *Germania*, translated by MAURICE HUTTON. (Loeb Classical Library.) New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. 371. \$1.50.

Principal Peterson's contribution to this volume displays the merits that his reputation as a Tacitean critic and editor would lead us to anticipate. The English version is characterized by lucidity and taste. A careful perusal reveals much to praise and little to which exception can be justly taken. Perhaps there are a few tokens of a tendency to embellish or modify the original by a graphic insertion or a metaphorical turn alien to the Latin. This is a temptation to which a translator finds it easy to succumb, if he have the gifts of vivid diction and lively imagination. Cases in point are: pp. 30-31, *novam et recentem curam*, "some new composition, just off the stocks"; pp. 46-47, *inter . . . lacrimas reorum*, "in association with accused persons, weeping for all they are worth"; pp. 100-101, *satis multos offendi*, "I have put up the backs of quite a number"; pp. 124-25, *omnia . . . omnes poterant*, "the crowd ruled the roost." One is puzzled to see why, with the classic precedent of "Drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring," the metaphor in *quasdam artes haurire, omnes libare debet* (pp. 98-99)

was shifted thus: "he ought thoroughly to absorb certain branches of study, . . . have a bowing acquaintance with them all." On pp. 90-91 Tacitus can scarcely have meant by *infante domino* what Principal Peterson's "lispin little lord" reads into the passage; "baby-master" is far enough to go—*der iunge zukünftige Herr*, according to Gudeman, 2d ed. The translator will relish the practical joke which his psychological processes have played on him on pp. 72-73, where *inter Menenius et Appios* is rendered "in the company of people like Menenius and Agrippa." The latent memory of Menenius Agrippa, of course, has cast out poor Claudius Caecus into the outer darkness!

An important feature of Principal Peterson's offering is the text, embodying as it does a careful revision of his own previous work in this field and an evaluation of the views of other scholars. In so many as thirty-six instances, most of which are discussed in critical notes, the author has departed from the text of his edition. Other times, other opinions! On the whole, the new text is marked by a greater conservatism than the old and by a more critical attitude toward his own conjectures. In eleven contexts he has rejected emendations of his own or of other scholars in favor of the manuscript readings. In six he has abandoned a former reading of his own and incorporated the conjecture of another.

The text is all but free from misprints. However, on p. 122, *Publico* . . . *Scipione*, a mistake in Halm, has insinuated itself.

It is the ungracious duty of the reviewer to point out that the *Agricola* and the *Germania* have been handled in a manner that bring disappointment to students of Tacitus and no credit to the Loeb series. It is kind to suppose that the translator did not take the exegetical and the critical part of his work seriously. The information dispensed to the reader concerning the literary form, the purpose of the *Agricola*, and the textual tradition of both treatises, is of the vintage of the late nineties. Thus we are told that "only two manuscripts [of the *Agricola*, i.e.] practically are in existence" (p. 149). Gudeman is quoted as authority for the existence of the *Toletanus*; the statement in question is found in the preface to the American edition, issued in 1899. Leuze's collation of the *Toletanus*, the accuracy of which was afterward confirmed by Professor Abbott, has evidently escaped Professor Hutton's notice. If he had glanced at the critical appendix of Gudeman's German edition of the *Agricola*, a book which is duly listed on p. 161, under the caption of "Other Authorities Consulted," he could have saved himself from making the obsolete assertions contained on pp. 149-51. Of the *Aesinus* he has heard, Principal Peterson having been his informant. However, the translator has no cognizance of the revolution which the discovery of this manuscript has effected in the text tradition. It goes without saying, therefore, that the numerous certain corrections which the *Aesinus* has made possible, notably in the text of the *Agricola*, are withheld from the readers of Professor Hutton's work.

Professor Hutton solves the problem of the literary form of the *Agricola* by dubbing the treatise a "*ballon d'essai*, . . . an introduction to and excerpt from" the *Histories*. Such a conclusion does scant honor to Leo's masterly discussion of this subject in *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* and is at variance with the consensus of latter-day opinion. In his work on the *Germania*, when he goes beyond Church and Brodribb, Furneaux, and Gudeman for information on matters pertaining to ethnology, religion, and institutions, Professor Hutton has placed his reliance on the ancient *Germania* of Latham (London, 1851). There is no indication of anything save utter ignorance of the books of Müllenhoff, Baumstark, Andresen, Wolff, Schweizer-Sidler, and the host of other German scholars who have made this field so largely their own.

We read on p. 160 that the *Agricola* was selected for translation by Professor Hutton because of the appeal of its "purple passages" and of such chapters as 30, 32, 45, and 46. The reviewer is glad to believe that the English versions were the parts of the work which were wrought *con amore*. Skilful rendition and happy phrase are not lacking. Occasionally, labored vivacity or exuberance of imagination surprises the reader with such expressions as, p. 239, "to put his hatred in cold storage" (*reponere odium*); p. 315, "mighty trek" (*magni exitus*). Candor compels the assertion that the accuracy of the translations leaves much to be desiderated. The number of mistakes, quite apart from debatable contexts where the translator adopts questionable interpretations discarded by recent critics, actually mounts into the scores. These blunders comprise omissions, failure to grasp and to reproduce the sequence of thought in sentence structure, ambiguous English, errors of a rudimentary type. Few pages of the *Agricola* are free from blemishes of these kinds; in the *Germania* they are not so frequent. A few specimens must suffice: p. 171, *in comitio ac foro*, "in the courtyard of the Forum"; p. 191, *viva ac spirantia saxis avelli*, "torn alive and still breathing from the shell"; p. 197, *compositis prioribus*, "he arranged the outstanding difficulties"; p. 205, *multus in agmine*, "constantly on the march"; p. 213, *mixti copiis et laetitia*, "gathering their exultant forces"; p. 237, *fumantia procul*, "smoking to heaven"; p. 271, *argentea vasa*, "silver vases"; *legatis et principibus*, "commanders and chieftains." Some of the more serious omissions are: p. 221, *varia fortuna*; p. 225, *silvas*; p. 231, *conexi*; p. 279, *publice*.

The appendices contain a miscellany of notes which offer little of moment to those who are acquainted with the critical literature.

DUANE REED STUART

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Marci Antonini Imperatoris in semet ipsum libri. Recognovit
HENRICUS SCHENKL. Editio maior. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner,
1913. Pp. xl+267. M. 4.80.

Idem. Editio minor. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. Pp. x+168. M. 2.

The editio maior contains an ample Praefatio, pp. iii-xxxii, a Conspectus Notarum, pp. xxxiii-xxxviii, Inscriptiones Testimonia, pp. xxxviii-xxxix, Corrigenda et Addenda, p. xl, Text, with testimonia and brief apparatus criticus, pp. 1-159, Scholia, pp. 160-61, Capitum Divisiones, pp. 161-64, Adnotationis Supplementum, pp. 165-95, Index Nominum et Locorum, pp. 195-98, Index Verborum, pp. 198-267. The editio minor omits the Praefatio, Adnotationis Supplementum, and Index Verborum.

This new edition of Marcus Aurelius in the Teubner series naturally challenges comparison with those of Stich and Leopold, and the comparison is distinctly in its favor. As against the former, the collation and evaluation of the manuscripts and the criticism of suggested emendations given by Schenkl is a great step in advance; in comparison with the latter, the Index Verborum constitutes a valuable addition. We have thus an edition which all readers of the philosopher on the throne should use. So thoroughly has the editor studied the MSS, editions and critical literature dealing with his author that we are safe in saying that it will be long before anything material shall be added to our resources, and consequently before another editor will be justified in undertaking a critical edition. What may be expected is at most a revision by the editor himself.

Of the editor's laborious and meticulous study of the MSS a reviewer can say nothing except in its praise. In so difficult an author, where the best tradition is extremely faulty, one may differ in details from the conclusions and preferences of the editor; but in most cases one will feel that the editor, after his comprehensive study, is as likely to be right as another. I have long read Marcus Aurelius and have made many tentative suggestions as to readings. This edition has shown that in most cases others had hit upon the same things, and I am pleased to see about half of their number adopted in the text duly credited to those who proposed them. As I have hitherto refrained from publishing emendations of Marcus Aurelius, I will here set down one which seems to have occurred to no one else, and yet seems to me all but certain: vi. 43 (p. 73, 9): *Μῆτι ὁ ἥλιος τὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀξιοῖ ποιεῖν; μῆτι ὁ Ἀσκληπιὸς τὰ τῆς Καρποφόρου;* Here I should read *ὁ ἥλιος τὰ τοῦ Ἰγέρου.*

The editor himself has been prolific of emendations and more or less hesitating suggestions introduced with *fortasse* or *malim*. A rough count of their number yields upward of a hundred instances. It is needless to say that many will never be adopted. One addition to the criticism of Marcus Aurelius which Schenkl has made available is the contribution of a scholar in whom American classical scholars are sure to take an interest. It was Capell Löff, the younger, who made this contribution. Born in England

in 1806, entered at King's College, Cambridge, 1825, where he subsequently distinguished himself as a classical scholar and became a Fellow, he resided in America during the Civil War and "while living in the wilds of Minnesota, prepared an edition of the Self-Communion of Marcus Aurelius with critical notes to the Greek text. *Μαρκου Αυρουλιου τα εις εαυτον*, sive ad seipsum commentarii morales. Recensuit, denuo ordinavit, expurgavit, restituit, notis illustravit . . . C. L. Porcher, N. Eboraci U.S. A.D. 1861. A. libertae reip. l'" (so the *National Dictionary of Biography*). I have never seen the book, which the editor, as in several other instances, signed with a pseudonym. Whether he took the name Porcher in allusion to the *Stoa* or *Porch*, or because he had been called to the bar of the Middle Temple in 1834, I do not know. It is interesting to think of a scholar "in the wilds of Minnesota" engaged in textual criticism at a time when American scholars generally were content to work with things classical in a very different spirit. It is said that many of his suggestions were wild, as were his surroundings, but Schenkl's notes show a goodly number which are eminently deserving of consideration. In his old age Lofft purchased an estate called Millmead, in Virginia, where he died October 1, 1873.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Cicero und die epikureische Philosophie. Eine quellenkritische Studie. Munich Dissertation by HANS URI. Leipzig, 1914. Pp. 116.

Hunting for sources will never cease, for probability and not certainty is the usual result of such speculation. Scholars are agreed that Cicero's knowledge of Epicureanism was derived from Greek sources, but beyond that there is no agreement and there cannot be. Uri would have Antiochus Cicero's principal authority in the refutation of Epicureanism, but he thinks that the exposition of the ethics of the school, given in the first book of the *De finibus*, was drawn from one compendium; and that Cicero was often independent in his treatment. Naturally, there can be no certainty in such theorizing; and, indeed, it is of no very great importance whom Cicero followed. His exposition is readable, even if not always accurate, and he has saved for us by the charm of his style and through his eloquent diction much that has perished of the work of the post-Aristotelian schools. His object was to present the broad outlines of the ethical systems that were popular in his day. He never took Epicureanism seriously; it was to him verily a simple philosophy, but it had not the simplicity of a gospel. We cannot suppose that, having this mental attitude, he was careful about the competency of his authorities. Uri has in his 116 pages covered the subject well. There is much polemic against earlier investigators, but most people will be satisfied with the supposition that book i of the *De finibus* was founded

on a compendium and book ii on Antiochus, so far as Cicero needed an authority. Whether Cicero used one or two or three pamphlets is really of little consequence.

W. A. MERRILL

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Kleine Schriften. By OTTO HIRSCHFELD. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. Pp. 1011. M. 30.

Fifty years after the appearance of his dissertation, Hirschfeld has gathered into a book of over one thousand pages the more important of his shorter studies. The volume contains seventy-four numbers, fifteen of which have not appeared in print before. Twelve of his published papers are not included in the book.

Much that is here has been summed up in masterly fashion in that *vade mecum* of historical students, *Die kaiserl. Verwaltungsbeamten*, but even so we welcome in a single volume the fuller treatment of such important papers as "Der Grundbesitz der römischen Kaiser" (No. 38), "Die Sicherheitspolizei" (No. 39), and "Die Rangtitel der römischen Kaiserzeit" (No. 42). And Hirschfeld's essays have always been so orderly, so thorough, and so packed with matter that they will continue to have a real value even when partly superseded by the discovery of new material or new arguments.

The older essays are so well known that they hardly call for new comment now. Those published now for the first time are not of great importance, having apparently been left unprinted hitherto because of their slightness. However, they all contain suggestions of value, and a few may be mentioned. No. 14, "Zur Geschichte der römischen Tribus" (1908), proposes the theory that the Roman tribes were first created in 495 B.C. in connection with the secession of the plebs and the division of the *ager publicus*. Support for this theory he seeks in a literal interpretation of *factae* in Livy ii. 21. 7, "Romae tribus una et xx factae." This may be correct, but we must note that Livy himself did not take the word in this sense, since he assumes the existence of tribes before 495. A precise authority is obviously not worth much if it must be interpreted contrary to the spirit of the author. In No. 16, "Die Beseitigung der Comitia centuriata für die Beamtenwahlen" (1912) he concludes, from Cic. *Ad. Att.* iv. 16. 8 and Suet. *Jul.* 41, that the election of magistrates was taken from the centuriate assembly before, but not long before, 54 B.C. No. 17, "Zur Geschichte des Decemvirats" (1909), points out that since the decemviral board contained plebeians as well as patricians, and in its executive functions it displaced the patrician consuls, its overthrow was probably not due to plebeian opposition but to the patricians, who desired to regain exclusive control of the executive office. In No. 28, "Augustus ein Inschriftenfalscher?" (1908), Hirschfeld opposes the theory of Dessau that Augustus had changed an early inscription of Cossus

(see Livy iv. 20) in order to honor a friend. Our author saves the emperor's reputation for veracity by suggesting that he may inadvertently have taken the archaic form *Coso*=*Cosso* as an old abbreviation for *Consul*. No 68 (1913) is an interesting essay on political conditions during the empire.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

TENNEY FRANK

Euripides Medea mit Scholien. Von ERNST DIEHL. Bonn: Marcus u. Weber, 1911. Pp. 116. M. 2.60.

Supplementum Euripideum. Von H. VON ARNIM. Bonn: Marcus u. Weber, 1913. Pp. 80. M. 2.

Supplementum Sophocleum. Edidit ERNESTUS DIEHL. Bonn: Marcus u. Weber, 1913. Pp. 33. M. 0.90.

These three volumes are Nos. 89, 112, and 113 in the series known as "Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen." The publishers are to be congratulated for their enterprise in issuing so useful and inexpensive a collection. Every number has some distinctive feature and comprises material which could be assembled in the usual form only at much greater cost. Diehl's edition of the *Medea*, containing as it does a judicious selection of scholia and critical notes, is particularly valuable for use in a pro-seminar. I think, however, that an error of judgment was made in not mentioning the following conjectural readings: Earle's γὰρ γῆς at vs. 106, Musgrave's οἶψ at vs. 240, and Barnes's γὰρ νῦν at vs. 1296. The two *Supplementa* naturally are most serviceable to those who do not have access to the latest papyri publications, but provide a convenient résumé also for others. The one for Sophocles is mainly devoted to the *Ichneutae*, the text of which has been bettered at several points in the last two years and still demands many additional improvements. It is too bad that the fragments of the satyr-play in Oxyrhynchus Papyri VIII, which many scholars attribute to Sophocles, could not have been included in this volume. The *Supplementum Euripideum* begins with Satyrus' *Vita* and contains fragments from ten plays. As I have already stated on several occasions, it is desirable that all the fragments of Euripides, old as well as new, should be assembled into a fascicle by some competent editor.

R. C. F.

Morphologie historique du latin. (Nouvelle collection à l'usage des classes XXXII.) By A. ERNOUT. Paris: Klincksieck, 1914. Pp. xiii+367. Fr. 3.50.

The present handy little volume forms a continuation of Niedermann's *Phonétique historique du latin*, which appeared in 1906 in the same series. The necessity of referring to another volume for a statement of the phonetic

laws which have operated in the terminations discussed is of course a handicap; but against this we may set the advantage of having a whole volume at disposal for the discussion of the terminations alone. We have a right, therefore, to expect the discussion to be full and accurate, and free from carelessness of statement in the minutiae of the subject.

Precisely here is where the reviewer finds the book unsatisfactory. A few instances from the early part of the book will suffice. Page 6: a reference to *IF.*, XXX, 219, would give a clue to other supposed duals of the type *Cestio*; but there is no such reference, and we miss also a positive interpretation of the form, for it is unsatisfactory to find merely that "ces formes isolées ne suffisent pas à prouver l'existence en latin d'un duel à l'époque historique." What does Ernout himself think of them? Page 15, *infra*: that an *e*, situated like the second *e* in *generis*, might represent an earlier *u* is certainly not among the accepted theories of sound development in Latin. Page 17, *infra*: the *-ūs* of the genitive singular of the fourth declension is said to rest upon IE. *-ous*; but *-eus* is equally possible, and is distinctly favored by the *-eis* (not *-ois*) of the genitive of *i*-stems in Oscan. Pages 21-27: the discussion of the case endings is here partly from the Latin standpoint and partly from the Indo-European, and is therefore quite confusing. Pages 22 and 43: On the origin of the genitive singular in *-ī*, the view of Ehrlich, *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung*, pp. 67 ff., should at least be taken into consideration and a reference given; and so should that of Wackernagel, *Mélanges Saussure*, 125 ff. The claims of *-ai* as the ending of the dative singular in consonant stems (witness *δόμῃναι*) seem stronger than those of *-ei*, despite *Διφτί-φίλος* (cf. *KZ.*, XLIV, 161 ff.). Pages 25 and 29: that *-a* of the neuter plural is really based on IE. short *a* can hardly be maintained in the face of the Oscan and Umbrian forms and the tens from *trīgintā* to *nōnāgintā*. Pages 26 and 50: the original length of the diphthong in the dative-ablative plural of *ā*- and *o*-stems should be indicated. Pages 30-31: the explanation of the genitive *-āī* and *-ae* is quite unsatisfactory. For the late popular form in *-aes*, the Greek influence is certain; to suggest as an alternative the influence of an Oscan-Umbrian form in *-ās* is unnecessary and without plausibility, on grounds of chronology. Page 33, *infra*: the citation of a Sanskrit form or two would establish the genitive plural ending *-śm* infinitely better than anything else. Page 34: the forms in *-ābus* are patently new forms, not survivals. Page 39: the production of nominative *-is*, accusative *-im*, in *iō*-stems is not to be set earlier than the syncope in *ro*-stems. Page 40: through careless expression the preposterous development **agros* > **agrs* > **agrr* > **agr* > **agr* > *ager* is given, whereas the second form must at once change the *r* from consonant to vowel. Page 42: there is no evidence that the vocative of *ro*-stems is the phonetic descendant of the original vocative form rather than a nominative used as a vocative. Page 45: the presence of adverbs in *-ēd* suggests that this form was not originally an instrumental in *-ē*, but an ablative in *-ēd*,

and that the distinction between the adverb and the noun form in *-ōd* was a mere artificial distinction, like that between *ācer* and *ācris* in the nominative singular (cf. Ernout, p. 75). Page 46: here, as also at several other points, the results of Sturtevant, *Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin īo and īā-Stems*, and of "deus," "is," and "idem," might profitably have been utilized. Page 47: on the value of Lucilius' rules for distinguishing between *i* and *ei* in writing, the fantastic view of Sommer seems less likely than either of two other views recently put forth in print; cf. *AJP.*, XXXIV, 315 ff., with bibliography. Page 51: the influence of *πλῆθος* and *venenum* on the gender of *vulgus* and *virus* seems at least a factor that might be mentioned.

But enough; page after page could be filled with such details, and what has been said should show satisfactorily that Ernout's book must be used with care and with reserve. Another disappointment is his failure to indicate his own view as to the solution of problems of particular difficulty, where he might surely give the alternative views which seem to him least unlikely, with reference to the important articles. A few examples from the latter portion of the book: why be so noncommittal about the passive infinitive in *-ier*, p. 244? about the origin of *sōns*, p. 245? about the origin of the gerundive, p. 247? about that of the perfect in *-uī*, p. 291 (cf. Sommer, *Handbuch d. lat. Laut.- u. Formenlehre*, 603 ff.)? about the third plural ending of the perfect in *-ēre*, p. 307?

Misprints are none too infrequent; and when we discover three misprints in the list of errata, tucked away at the end of the volume where we can hardly find it at all, *c'est à rire*.

Frankly speaking, the book is unsatisfactory. Its excuse for being should lie in newness of theories; or in accuracy and fulness of detail; or in being scrupulously up to date in the evaluation and utilization of periodical literature. Were it first class in all these points, it would be a welcome addition to our philological handbooks; but as it is, it will not serve to warn off others from the field, in the way in which Caesar's historical writings, through their surpassing qualities, deterred other historians of the first class from writing on the same events, according to what Cicero represents Brutus as saying (*Brut.* 75. 262).

ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

